

Local elliptic regularity for solutions to stationary Fokker-Planck equations via Dirichlet forms and resolvents

Haesung Lee

Abstract. In this paper, we show that, for a solution to the stationary Fokker-Planck equation with general coefficients, defined as a measure with an L^2 -density, this density not only exhibits $H^{1,2}$ -regularity but also Hölder continuity. To achieve this, we first construct a reference measure $\mu = \rho dx$ by utilizing existence and elliptic regularity results for homogeneous boundary value problems, ensuring that the given divergence-type operator corresponds to a sectorial Dirichlet form. By employing elliptic regularity results for both divergence and non-divergence type equations, we demonstrate that the image of the resolvent operator associated with the sectorial Dirichlet form has $H^{2,2}$ -regularity. Furthermore, through calculations based on the Dirichlet form and the $H^{2,2}$ -regularity of the resolvent operator, we prove that the density of the solution measure for the stationary Fokker-Planck equation is, indeed, the weak limit of $H^{1,2}$ -functions defined via the resolvent operator. Our results highlight the central role of Dirichlet form theory and resolvent approximations in establishing the regularity of solutions to stationary Fokker-Planck equations with general coefficients.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): Primary: 35B65, 35Q84, 31C25, Secondary: 60J60, 60J35, 35D30

Keywords: Stationary Fokker-Planck equations, infinitesimally invariant measures, elliptic regularity, Dirichlet forms, resolvents, weak solutions

1 Introduction

The connection between stochastic differential equations (SDEs) and partial differential equations (PDEs) is often established through the Fokker-Planck equations. To explain this connection, consider a diffusion process

$$\mathbb{M} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathbb{P}_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, (X_t)_{t \geq 0}),$$

satisfying the following Itô-stochastic differential equation: for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s) dW_s + \int_0^t \mathbf{G}(X_s) ds, \quad 0 \leq t < \infty, \quad \mathbb{P}_x\text{-a.s.},$$

where $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a standard $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -Brownian motion, $\sigma = (\sigma_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ is a $d \times d$ matrix of functions, and \mathbf{G} is a vector field. Here, both σ and \mathbf{G} are assumed to satisfy certain regularity and growth conditions. If we additionally assume that the one-dimensional marginal distribution of $(X_t)_{t > 0}$ under \mathbb{P}_x has a density $(p_t^x(y))_{t > 0}$ with respect to dy , i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}_x(X_t \in E) = \int_E p_t^x(y) dy, \quad \text{for any } E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d), t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

then it can be derived by Itô's formula and some calculations that, for any $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g \in C_0^\infty((0, \infty))$,

$$\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\partial_t(f(y)g(t)) + \frac{1}{2} \text{trace}(A \nabla^2(f(y)g(t))) + \langle \mathbf{G}, \nabla(f(y)g(t)) \rangle \right) p_t^x(y) dy dt = 0, \quad (1)$$

where $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} := \sigma \sigma^T$. In that case, $(p_t^x(y) dy dt)_{t > 0}$ is called a solution to the Fokker-Planck equation. Various analytic properties of solutions to Fokker-Planck equations with rough coefficients are systematically studied in [4, 6, 10]. Furthermore, one can investigate the stationary counterpart to

the above Fokker-Planck equation. For instance, if ν is an invariant probability measure for \mathbb{M} (cf. [22, Definition 3.43]), i.e. ν is a probability measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_t^x(y) f(y) dy \nu(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) \nu(dx), \quad \text{for all } f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

then integrating (1) with respect to $\nu(dx)$ and applying Fubini's theorem, we obtain that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Lf d\nu = 0, \quad \text{for all } f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where

$$Lf := \frac{1}{2} \text{trace}(A \nabla^2 f) + \langle \mathbf{G}, \nabla f \rangle, \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

In this regard, ν is referred to as a solution to the stationary Fokker-Planck equation or an infinitesimally invariant measure (cf. [23]), and formally it is written as $L^* \nu = 0$ (note that for the equation to make sense, it is required that $\|\mathbf{G}\| + |c| \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \nu)$). Concerning this type of stationary Fokker-Planck equations, extensive studies have been conducted by [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9].

When appropriate regularity conditions are fulfilled for the diffusion process \mathbb{M} , the invariant probability measure ν can correspond to the stationary probability measure. In other words, the measure ν is represented as the limiting measure of the one-dimensional marginal distribution $p_t^x(y) dy$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ (see [22, Section 3.2.3]). This property enables invariant measures to provide a deterministic framework for analyzing random phenomena, making them highly applicable across various fields. Recently, they have been actively utilized in applications such as Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) (cf. [18, 26]) and image generation (cf. [31, 32]).

If the existence and uniqueness of a solution ν to the stationary Fokker-Planck equation are ensured, one can further study precise numerical computations to approximate ν . From a probabilistic perspective, a priori admissible regularity of ν is sufficiently described by its absolute continuity with respect to the Lebesgue measure, or more generally, by considering ν as a locally finite measure. However, such a level of low regularity is inadequate from a numerical standpoint. Specifically, when approximating solutions using Galerkin methods, it is natural to require the solution to exhibit at least local $H^{1,2}$ -regularity (cf. [11]). This requirement is not limited to classical numerical methods, but is also necessary for recent numerical methods, such as physics-informed neural networks (see [36] and references therein). In recent approaches involving physics-informed neural networks, where trial functions are constructed using neural networks, the continuity of the true solution is expected to play an important role in ensuring the stability of error analysis, particularly from the perspective of the universal approximation theorem (cf. [12, 17]). Consequently, determining whether the density of ν with respect to the Lebesgue measure belongs to $H_{loc}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ emerges as a mathematically significant problem.

It is well known that if the coefficients of L and c are all smooth and $\det(A) > 0$, then any ν satisfying $(L + c)^* \nu = 0$ must admit a smooth density with respect to dx , as established in [33, Chapter III], which is considered as a generalization of Weyl's lemma ([19, Corollary 2.2.1]). On the other hand, when the coefficients of L and c are locally Hölder continuous and $\det(A) > 0$, any ν satisfying $(L + c)^* \nu = 0$ is guaranteed to have a locally Hölder continuous density with respect to dx , as verified in [28]. Recent results ensuring the continuity of the density in cases with more singular drifts and zero-order terms have been extensively studied by V.I. Bogachev and S.V. Shaposhnikov. Precisely, in [7, Theorem 3.1], it was established that when the components of A are locally Hölder continuous, $\det(A) > 0$, $\mathbf{G} \in L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, and $c \in L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the density of ν satisfying $(L + c)^* \nu = 0$ is locally Hölder continuous. Moreover, the same theorem demonstrates that the continuity of the density of ν remains robust even when the components of A are relaxed to being Dini-continuous.

Meanwhile, various results regarding the local $H^{1,2}$ -regularity of the density of ν have been also presented. It has been shown in [16] that if the components of A are locally Lipschitz continuous, $\det(A) > 0$, and $c \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then any $\nu = h dx$ with $h \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $(- \text{div}(A \nabla) + c)^* \nu = 0$ always possesses a density $h \in H_{loc}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Indeed, this local $H^{1,2}$ -regularity result is motivated by the purpose of demonstrating the essential self-adjointness of the corresponding operator. From this perspective, [1] study the case where $A = id$, establishing the general Sobolev regularity of the solution ν and essential

self-adjointness of the corresponding Dirichlet operators. Precisely, it is shown in [1, Theorem 1] that if $A = id$, $\mathbf{G} \in L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, and $c \in L_{loc}^{\frac{pd}{p+d}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $p \in (d, \infty)$, then ν which is a solution to $(L + c)^*\nu = 0$ has a density in $H_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C_{loc}^{0,1-d/p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Subsequently, this result is generalized to the case where the components of A satisfy $H_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $p \in (d, \infty)$ and $\det(A) > 0$ and detailed results on this generalization are provided in [2, 4, 6]. As additional references, we refer to [21, 14] for recent results on the regularity of very weak solutions in the double divergence form, which is another name for the stationary Fokker-Planck equations.

Meanwhile, a novel approach to show the $H^{1,2}$ -regularity of the density of ν which is a solution to $L^*\nu = 0$ was introduced by W. Stannat. Through the results of [29, Theorem 2.1](cf. [22, Theorem 2.20]), it is shown that if the components of A are locally Hölder continuous, \mathbf{G} merely satisfies $L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, and the density of ν , which satisfies $L^*\nu = 0$, is assumed to be a priori in $L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then the density of ν with respect to the Lebesgue measure is shown to belong to $H_{loc}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The main idea employed in this approach is to construct a resolvent operator $(V_\alpha)_{\alpha>0}$ corresponding to the non-divergence type operator $\sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij}\partial_i\partial_j$ and to demonstrate, via the Banach-Alaoglu theorem, that for $\nu = h dx$ with $L^*\nu = 0$, the function h is indeed a local $H^{1,2}$ -weak limit of $(\alpha V_\alpha h)_{\alpha>0}$ as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$. This idea was subsequently inherited in [24] via the Dirichlet form theory. Indeed, it was shown in [24, Theorem 3.3] that if $A = id$ and $\mathbf{G} = \frac{1}{\rho}\nabla\rho$ with $d \geq 3$, where ρ is locally bounded below and above by strictly positive constants and $\nabla\rho \in L_{loc}^d(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, then for any $\nu = h dx$ satisfying $L^*\nu = 0$ with $h \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, it follows from resolvent approximations that $h \in H_{loc}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Building upon the above results, we now introduce our main results as follows:

Theorem 1.1 *Let U be a (possibly unbounded) open subset of \mathbb{R}^d with $d \geq 3$. Let $\mathbf{H} \in L_{loc}^p(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $p \in (d, \infty)$, and let $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ be a (possibly non-symmetric) matrix of functions, where $a_{ij} \in VMO_{loc}(U)$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ (see Definition 2.1), and $\operatorname{div} A \in L_{loc}^d(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ (see Definition 2.2). Assume that A is locally uniformly strictly elliptic and bounded on U , i.e. for each open ball V with $\bar{V} \subset U$ there exist strictly positive constants λ_V and M_V such that*

$$\lambda_V \|\xi\|^2 \leq \langle A(x)\xi, \xi \rangle, \quad \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} |a_{ij}(x)| \leq M_V, \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in V \text{ and for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (2)$$

As in Proposition 5.6, consider a partial differential operator $(\mathcal{L}, C_0^\infty(U))$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}f &= \operatorname{div}(A\nabla f) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla f \rangle \\ &= \operatorname{trace}(A\nabla^2 f) + \langle \operatorname{div} A + \mathbf{H}, \nabla f \rangle, \quad f \in C_0^\infty(U). \end{aligned}$$

Let $c \in L_{loc}^d(U)$, $\mathbf{F} \in L_{loc}^q(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $q \in [2, \infty)$ and $f \in L_{loc}^{\frac{qd}{q+d}}(U)$. Assume that $h \in L_{loc}^2(U)$ satisfies

$$\int_U (\mathcal{L}\varphi + c\varphi) h dx = \int_U f\varphi dx + \int_U \langle \mathbf{F}, \nabla\varphi \rangle dx, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(U). \quad (3)$$

Then, $h \in H_{loc}^{1,p \wedge q}(U)$. In particular, if $q \in (d, \infty)$, then $h \in C_{loc}^{0,\beta}(U)$ with $\beta = 1 - \frac{d}{p \wedge q}$ by the Sobolev embedding.

The main idea for the proof of Theorem 1.1 is to find a suitable reference measure $\mu = \rho dx$ (see Theorem 3.1), so that we can convert the divergence type operator \mathcal{L} to $L^0 + \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla \rangle$ (see (12)), where L^0 is an operator associated to a sectorial Dirichlet form on $L^2(B, \mu)$ (see (11)), B is an open ball and \mathbf{B} is a weakly divergence-free vector field with respect to μ . As a result, due to the sufficient integrability of \mathbf{B} , the sectorial Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^B, D(\mathcal{E}^B))$ corresponding to $L^0 + \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla \rangle$ can be constructed as the closure of (10) in $L^2(B, \mu)$. Ultimately, by leveraging the corresponding resolvent through Dirichlet form theory and elliptic regularity results for boundary value problems in Theorem 3.4, we inherit the original idea of [29, Theorem 3.3] and, through detailed computations, obtain the main result, Theorem 1.1. Ultimately, by resolvent approximations, we demonstrate that h is indeed the $H^{1,2}$ -weak limit of a subsequence of $(\alpha G_\alpha^B h)_{\alpha>0}$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$, where $(G_\alpha^B)_{\alpha>0}$ denotes the resolvent associated with the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^B, D(\mathcal{E}^B))$. As a direct

consequence of Theorem 1.1, we present the following local elliptic regularity result for non-divergence type operators:

Corollary 1.2 *Let U be a (possibly unbounded) open subset of \mathbb{R}^d with $d \geq 3$. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{H}} \in L_{loc}^p(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $p \in (d, \infty)$, $c \in L_{loc}^d(U)$, and let $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ be a (possibly non-symmetric) matrix of functions where $a_{ij} \in VMO_{loc}(U)$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ (see Definition 2.1), and $\operatorname{div} A \in L_{loc}^p(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ (see Definition 2.2). Assume that A is locally uniformly strictly elliptic and bounded on U , i.e. (2) holds. Let $\mathbf{F} \in L_{loc}^q(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $q \in [2, \infty)$, and $f \in L_{loc}^{\frac{qd}{q+d}}(U)$. Assume that $h \in L_{loc}^2(U)$ satisfies*

$$\int_U \left(\operatorname{trace}(A \nabla^2 \varphi) + \langle \tilde{\mathbf{H}}, \nabla \varphi \rangle + c \varphi \right) h \, dx = \int_U f \varphi \, dx + \int_U \langle \mathbf{F}, \nabla \varphi \rangle \, dx, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(U).$$

Then, $h \in H_{loc}^{1, p \wedge q}(U)$. In particular, if $q \in (d, \infty)$, then $h \in C_{loc}^{0, \beta}(U)$ with $\beta = 1 - \frac{d}{p \wedge q}$ by the Sobolev embedding.

Combining Corollary 1.2 and [7, Theorem 2.1], we directly obtain the following regularity result for general signed measure ν :

Corollary 1.3 *Let U be a (possibly unbounded) open subset of \mathbb{R}^d with $d \geq 3$. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{H}} \in L_{loc}^p(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$, $c \in L_{loc}^p(U)$ with $p \in (d, \infty)$, and let $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ be a (possibly non-symmetric) matrix of functions where $a_{ij} \in VMO_{loc}(U)$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ (see Definition 2.1), and $\operatorname{div} A \in L_{loc}^p(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ (see Definition 2.2). Assume that A is locally uniformly strictly elliptic and bounded on U , i.e. (2) holds. Let ν be a locally finite signed measure satisfying that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{H}}\| + |c| \in L_{loc}^1(U, \nu)$ and*

$$\int_U \left(\operatorname{trace}(A \nabla^2 \varphi) + \langle \tilde{\mathbf{H}}, \nabla \varphi \rangle + c \varphi \right) d\nu = 0, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(U).$$

Then, there exists $h \in H_{loc}^{1, p}(U) \cap C_{loc}^{0, 1-d/p}(U)$ such that $\nu = h dx$.

This paper is structured as follows: Section 2 provides a comprehensive explanation of the notations and conventions that are mainly used throughout this paper. Section 3 establishes the critical framework for deriving the main results of this paper by constructing sectorial Dirichlet forms and their corresponding resolvents and generators. Section 4 presents the detailed proofs of the main results introduced in the introduction. Section 5 provides essential auxiliary results that are instrumental for the completeness and accuracy of the main proofs. Finally, Section 6 presents a brief conclusion of this paper and discusses directions for future research.

2 Notations and conventions

In this study, we consider the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d with $d \geq 1$, which is equipped with the standard Euclidean inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and the corresponding Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|$. For any point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and radius $r > 0$, the open ball centered at x_0 with radius r is denoted by $B_r(x_0) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - x_0\| < r\}$. For real numbers $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a \leq b$, we use the notation $a \wedge b := a$ and $a \vee b := b$. Let dx denote the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d . Let U be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d . The set of all Borel measurable functions on U is denoted by $\mathcal{B}(U)$. For $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}(U)$, \mathcal{A}_0 consists of functions $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\operatorname{supp}(f dx)$ is compact and contained in U . The space of continuous functions on U and its closure \bar{U} are denoted by $C(U)$ and $C(\bar{U})$, respectively, and let $C_0(U) := C(\bar{U})_0$. For $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, the space of k -times continuously differentiable functions on U is denoted by $C^k(U)$, and $C_0^k(U) := C^k(U) \cap C_0(U)$. For $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, the space $C^k(\bar{U})$ consists of all functions f on \bar{U} for which there exist an open set $V \supset \bar{U}$ and a function $\tilde{f} \in C^k(V)$ such that $\tilde{f} = f$ on \bar{U} . Let $r \in [1, \infty]$. The L^r -space on U with respect to a measure ν is denoted by $L^r(U, \nu)$, equipped with the standard L^r -norm with respect to ν . The space $L^r(U, \mathbb{R}^d, \nu)$ denotes the space of all L^r -vector fields on U with respect to ν with the norm $\|\mathbf{F}\|_{L^r(U, \nu)} := \|\|\mathbf{F}\|\|_{L^r(U, \nu)}$.

The localized L^r -space with respect to ν , $L^r_{loc}(U, \nu)$, is the set of all Borel measurable functions f on U such that $f1_W \in L^r(U, \nu)$ for any bounded open set $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\overline{W} \subset U$. Similarly, $L^r_{loc}(U, \mathbb{R}^d, \nu)$ is the set of all vector fields \mathbf{F} satisfying $\|\mathbf{F}\| \in L^r_{loc}(U, \nu)$. For simplicity, we write $L^r(U) := L^r(U, dx)$, $L^r_{loc}(U) := L^r_{loc}(U, dx)$, $L^r(U, \mathbb{R}^d) := L^r(U, \mathbb{R}^d, dx)$, and $L^r_{loc}(U, \mathbb{R}^d) := L^r_{loc}(U, \mathbb{R}^d, dx)$. For a function f defined on U , the weak partial derivative with respect to the i -th coordinate is denoted by $\partial_i f$, provided it exists. The Sobolev space $H^{1,r}(U)$ consists of all functions $f \in L^r(U)$ for which $\partial_i f \in L^r(U)$ for each $i = 1, \dots, d$, equipped with the usual $H^{1,r}(U)$ -norm. The subspace $H^{1,q}_0(U)$, for $q \in [1, \infty)$, is defined as the closure of $C^\infty_0(U)$ in $H^{1,q}(U)$. The Sobolev space $H^{2,r}(U)$ consists of all functions $f \in L^r(U)$ with $\partial_i f \in L^r(U)$ and $\partial_i \partial_j f \in L^r(U)$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, d$ equipped with the usual $H^{2,r}(U)$ -norm. The weak Laplacian is denoted by $\Delta f := \sum_{i=1}^d \partial_i \partial_i f$. For a twice weakly differentiable function f , the weak Hessian matrix is given by $\nabla^2 f := (\partial_i \partial_j f)_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$. Let $\beta \in (0, 1]$. Then, define $C^{0,\beta}(\overline{U})$ as the set of all continuous functions f on \overline{U} satisfying that $\sup_{x,y \in \overline{U}} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\|x - y\|^\beta} < \infty$. $C^{0,\beta}_{loc}(U)$ denotes the set of all continuous functions f on U for which $f \in C^{0,\beta}(\overline{V})$ for any bounded open set V with $\overline{V} \subset U$. For a matrix $B = (b_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$, its trace is defined as $\text{trace}(B) := \sum_{i=1}^d b_{ii}$. Throughout this work, we let $2_* := \frac{2d}{d+2}$ if $d \geq 3$.

Definition 2.1 Let $d \geq 1$, ω be a positive continuous function on $[0, \infty)$ with $\omega(0) = 0$. The set VMO consists of all functions $g \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for which

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d, r < R} r^{-2d} \int_{B_r(z)} \int_{B_r(z)} |g(x) - g(y)| dx dy \leq \omega(R), \quad \text{for every } R > 0.$$

For an open ball B in \mathbb{R}^d , $VMO(B)$ denotes all functions $f \in L^1(B)$ for which there exists $\tilde{f} \in VMO$ such that $\tilde{f}|_B = f$. For an open subset U of \mathbb{R}^d , $VMO_{loc}(U)$ denotes all functions $f \in L^1_{loc}(U)$ for which $f \in VMO(B)$ for any open ball B in \mathbb{R}^d with $\overline{B} \subset U$.

It is known that $C_0(\mathbb{R}^d) \cup W^{1,d}(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset VMO$ (see [24, Proposition 2.1]). Using simple extension properties and the partition of unity, it follows that for any open subset U of \mathbb{R}^d , $C(U) \cup W^{1,d}_{loc}(U) \subset VMO_{loc}(U)$. By the definition of VMO , if $f, g \in VMO$, then $f + g \in VMO$. Moreover, Proposition 5.1 demonstrates that the set of bounded VMO functions is closed under multiplication.

Definition 2.2 (i) Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open set with $d \geq 2$, $B = (b_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ be a (possibly non-symmetric) matrix of locally integrable functions on U and $\mathbf{E} = (e_1, \dots, e_d) \in L^1_{loc}(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$. We write $\text{div} B = \mathbf{E}$ if

$$\int_U \sum_{i,j=1}^d b_{ij} \partial_i \phi_j dx = - \int_U \sum_{j=1}^d e_j \phi_j dx \quad \text{for all } \phi_j \in C^\infty_0(U), j = 1, \dots, d. \quad (4)$$

In other words, if we consider the family of column vectors

$$\mathbf{b}_j = \begin{pmatrix} b_{1j} \\ \vdots \\ b_{dj} \end{pmatrix}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq d, \quad \text{i.e. } B = (\mathbf{b}_1 | \dots | \mathbf{b}_d),$$

then (4) is rewritten as

$$\int_U \sum_{j=1}^d \langle \mathbf{b}_j, \nabla \phi_j \rangle dx = - \int_U \langle \mathbf{E}, \Phi \rangle dx, \quad \text{for all } \Phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_d) \in C^\infty_0(U)^d.$$

(ii) Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open set with $d \geq 2$, $\mathbf{F} \in L^1_{loc}(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f \in L^1_{loc}(U)$. We write $\text{div} \mathbf{F} = f$ if

$$\int_U \langle \mathbf{F}, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx = - \int_U f \varphi dx, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C^\infty_0(U).$$

3 Dirichlet forms approach

(Hyp): $d \geq 3$, $\mathbf{H} \in L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $p \in (d, \infty)$, and $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ is a (possibly non-symmetric) matrix of functions on \mathbb{R}^d such that $a_{ij} \in VMO$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ (see Definition 2.2) and for some constants $\lambda, M > 0$,

$$\lambda \|\xi\|^2 \leq \langle A(x)\xi, \xi \rangle, \quad \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} |a_{ij}(x)| \leq M, \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Theorem 3.1 *Assume that (Hyp) holds. Then, there exists $\rho \in H^{1,p}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\rho(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle A^T \nabla \rho - \rho \mathbf{H}, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx = 0, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (5)$$

Proof First, by [22, Theorem 2.27(i)] there exists $\rho \in H^{1,2}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\rho(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that (5) holds. Now observe that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle A^T \nabla \rho, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \rho \mathbf{H}, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

and hence $\rho \in H^{1,p}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by [6, Theorem 1.8.3]. □

Under the assumption that (Hyp) holds, let ρ be as in Theorem 3.1, and

$$\mu := \rho dx, \quad \mathbf{B} := \mathbf{H} - \frac{1}{\rho} A \nabla \rho, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (6)$$

Then, Theorem 3.1 deduces that $\rho \mathbf{B} \in L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla \varphi \rangle d\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \rho \mathbf{B}, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \rho \mathbf{H} - A \nabla \rho, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx = 0, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (7)$$

In particular,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla \varphi \rangle \varphi d\mu = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla \varphi^2 \rangle d\mu = 0, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (8)$$

Let B be an open ball in \mathbb{R}^d and $f, g \in C_0^\infty(B)$. Since ρ is bounded below and above by strictly positive constants on \bar{B} , it follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the Sobolev inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_B \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla f \rangle g d\mu \right| &\leq \|\rho \mathbf{B}\|_{L^d(B)} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(B)} \|g\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}(B)} \\ &\leq \|\rho \mathbf{B}\|_{L^d(B)} \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(B)} \cdot \gamma \|\nabla g\|_{L^2(B)} \\ &\leq \gamma \frac{\max_{\bar{B}} \rho}{\min_{\bar{B}} \rho} \|\mathbf{B}\|_{L^d(B)} \left(\int_B \|\nabla f\|^2 d\mu \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_B \|\nabla g\|^2 d\mu \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma \max_{\bar{B}} \rho}{\lambda \min_{\bar{B}} \rho} \|\mathbf{B}\|_{L^d(B)} \left(\int_B \langle A \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle d\mu \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_B \langle A \nabla g, \nabla g \rangle d\mu \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\gamma > 0$. Now, define a positive bilinear form $(\mathcal{E}^B, C_0^\infty(B))$ given by

$$\mathcal{E}^B(f, g) = \int_B \langle A \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle d\mu - \int_B \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla f \rangle g d\mu, \quad f, g \in C_0^\infty(B). \quad (10)$$

Consequently, the following result demonstrates that the bilinear form $(\mathcal{E}^B, C_0^\infty(B))$ is closable on $L^2(B, \mu)$ and its closure on $L^2(B, \mu)$ is a Dirichlet form.

Theorem 3.2 Under the assumption of **(Hyp)**, let $\rho \in H_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be as in Theorem 3.1 and μ and \mathbf{B} be defined as in (6). Let B be an open ball in \mathbb{R}^d and define $(\mathcal{E}^B, C_0^\infty(B))$ as the positive bilinear form given by (10). Then, the following holds:

(i) $(\mathcal{E}^B, C_0^\infty(B))$ satisfies the strong sector condition, i.e.

$$\mathcal{E}^B(f, g) \leq c \mathcal{E}^B(f, f)^{1/2} \mathcal{E}^B(g, g)^{1/2}, \quad \text{for all } f, g \in C_0^\infty(B),$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant independent of $f, g \in C_0^\infty(B)$.

(ii) $(\mathcal{E}^B, C_0^\infty(B))$ is closable on $L^2(B, \mu)$ (see [25, Chapter I, Definition 3.1]), and hence its closure denoted by $(\mathcal{E}^B, D(\mathcal{E}^B))$ is a coercive closed form on $L^2(B, \mu)$ (see [25, Chapter I, Definition 2.4, Remark 3.2]). Indeed, $(\mathcal{E}^B, D(\mathcal{E}^B))$ is the smallest coercive closed form on $L^2(B, \mu)$ that extends $(\mathcal{E}^B, C_0^\infty(B))$.

(iii) $D(\mathcal{E}^0) = H_0^{1,2}(B)$ and

$$\mathcal{E}^B(f, g) = \int_B \langle A \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle d\mu - \int_B \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla f \rangle g d\mu, \quad \text{for all } f, g \in D(\mathcal{E}^B).$$

In particular,

$$\mathcal{E}^B(f, f) = \int_B \langle A \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle d\mu, \quad \text{for all } f \in D(\mathcal{E}^B).$$

(iv) $(\mathcal{E}^B, D(\mathcal{E}^B))$ is a Dirichlet form (refer to [25, Chapter I, Definition 4.5]).

Proof (i) Let $f, g \in C_0^\infty(B)$ be given. Applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, (8) and (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{E}^B(f, g)| &\leq \left| \int_B \langle A \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle d\mu \right| + \left| \int_B \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla f \rangle g d\mu \right| \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}^B(f, f)^{1/2} \mathcal{E}^B(g, g)^{1/2} + \frac{\gamma \max_{\overline{B}} \rho}{\lambda \min_{\overline{B}} \rho} \|\mathbf{B}\|_{L^d(B)} \mathcal{E}^B(f, f)^{1/2} \mathcal{E}^B(g, g)^{1/2} \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{\gamma \max_{\overline{B}} \rho}{\lambda \min_{\overline{B}} \rho} \|\mathbf{B}\|_{L^d(B)} \right) \mathcal{E}^B(f, f)^{1/2} \mathcal{E}^B(g, g)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) To show the closability of $(\mathcal{E}^B, C_0^\infty(B))$, let $(f_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset C_0^\infty(B)$ be such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = 0$ in $L^2(B, \mu)$ and $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}^B(f_n - f_m, f_n - f_m) = 0$. Then, (8) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B \langle A \nabla(f_n - f_m), \nabla(f_n - f_m) \rangle d\mu &= \int_B \langle A \nabla(f_n - f_m), \nabla(f_n - f_m) \rangle d\mu - \frac{1}{2} \int_B \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla(f_n - f_m)^2 \rangle d\mu \\ &= \mathcal{E}^B(f_n - f_m, f_n - f_m) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n, m \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\|\nabla(f_n - f_m)\|_{L^2(B, \mu)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_B \langle A \nabla(f_n - f_m), \nabla(f_n - f_m) \rangle d\mu \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n, m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since $L^2(B, \mu)$ is complete, for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ there exists $g_i \in L^2(B, \mu)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \partial_i f_n = g_i, \quad \text{in } L^2(B, \mu).$$

Now let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(B)$ and $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. Then,

$$\int_B g_i \varphi dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_B \partial_i f_n \cdot \varphi dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} - \int_B f_n \cdot \partial_i \varphi dx = 0.$$

Thus, $g_i = 0$ on B , and hence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nabla f_n = 0$ in $L^2(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$, so that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}^B(f_n, f_n) = 0$. Therefore, $(\mathcal{E}^B, C_0^\infty(B))$ is closable. The rest follows from the weak sector condition in (i).

(iii) Let $f \in D(\mathcal{E}^B)$. Then, there exists $(f_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset C_0^\infty(B)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = f$ in $L^2(B, \mu)$ and $\mathcal{E}^B(f_n - f_m, f_n - f_m) \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$. Then, $\|f_n - f_m\|_{H_0^{1,2}(U)} \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$. By the completeness of $H_0^{1,2}(B)$, there exists $\tilde{f} \in H_0^{1,2}(B)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = \tilde{f}$ in $H_0^{1,2}(B)$. Therefore, we have $f = \tilde{f} \in H_0^{1,2}(B)$. Conversely, let $f \in H_0^{1,2}(B)$. Then, there exists $(f_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset C_0^\infty(B)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = f$ in $H_0^{1,2}(B)$. Thus, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = f$ in $L^2(B, \mu)$ and $\mathcal{E}^B(f_n - f_m, f_n - f_m) \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, $f \in D(\mathcal{E}^B)$. For the rest assertion, let $f, g \in D(\mathcal{E}^0)$. Then, there exists $(f_n)_{n \geq 1}, (g_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset C_0^\infty(B)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = f, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n = g$ in $L^2(B, \mu)$ and $\mathcal{E}^B(f_n - f_m, f_n - f_m) \rightarrow 0, \mathcal{E}^B(g_n - g_m, g_n - g_m) \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, based on the arguments above $f, g \in H_0^{1,2}(B)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = f$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n = g$ in $H_0^{1,2}(B)$. Finally, since $\mathcal{E}^B(f, g) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}^B(f_n, g_n)$, the assertion follows.

(iv) Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varphi_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be a function defined as in Proposition 5.9. First consider $u \in C_0^\infty(B)$. Then, $\varphi_\varepsilon \circ u \in C_0^\infty(B)$. Define a bilinear form $(\mathcal{E}^{0,B}, C_0^\infty(B))$ given by

$$\mathcal{E}^{0,B}(f, g) := \int_B \langle A \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle d\mu, \quad f, g \in C_0^\infty(B). \quad (11)$$

Observe that

$$\mathcal{E}^{0,B}(\varphi_\varepsilon \circ u, u - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) = \int_B (\varphi'_\varepsilon \circ u)(1 - \varphi'_\varepsilon \circ u) \langle A \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle d\mu \geq 0,$$

and hence $\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{E}^{0,B}(\varphi_\varepsilon \circ u, u - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) \geq 0$. Likewise, $\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{E}^{0,B}(u - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u, \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) \geq 0$. Meanwhile, let

$$S_\varepsilon := - \int_B \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla(\varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) \rangle (u - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) d\mu.$$

Then, by Lebesgue's theorem and Proposition 5.10, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} S_\varepsilon &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_B (\varphi'_\varepsilon \circ u)(u - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) \langle -\mathbf{B}, \nabla u \rangle d\mu, \\ &= \int_B (1_{[0,1]} \circ u)(u - u^+ \wedge 1) \langle -\mathbf{B}, \nabla u \rangle d\mu = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, let

$$T_\varepsilon := - \int_B \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla(u - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) \rangle (\varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) d\mu.$$

Then, by Lebesgue's theorem and Proposition 5.10, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} T_\varepsilon &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_B (1 - \varphi'_\varepsilon \circ u)(\varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) \langle -\mathbf{B}, \nabla u \rangle d\mu \\ &= \int_B (1_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [0,1]} \circ u)(u^+ \wedge 1) \langle -\mathbf{B}, \nabla u \rangle d\mu = \int_B (1_{(1,\infty)} \circ u) \langle -\mathbf{B}, \nabla u \rangle d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $\Phi_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be as in Proposition 5.11. Then, $\Phi_\varepsilon \circ u \in C_0^\infty(B)$. Moreover, by Lebesgue's theorem and Proposition 5.11,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} T_\varepsilon &= \int_B (1_{(1,\infty)} \circ u) \langle -\mathbf{B}, \nabla u \rangle d\mu = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_B (\Phi'_\varepsilon \circ u) \langle -\mathbf{B}, \nabla u \rangle d\mu \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_B \langle -\mathbf{B}, \nabla(\Phi_\varepsilon \circ u) \rangle d\mu \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{E}^B(\varphi_\varepsilon \circ u, u - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) &= \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \left(\mathcal{E}^{0,B}(\varphi_\varepsilon \circ u, u - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) + S_\varepsilon \right) \\ &\geq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{E}^{0,B}(\varphi_\varepsilon \circ u, u - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) + \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} S_\varepsilon \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{E}^B(u - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u, \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) &= \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \left(\mathcal{E}^B(u - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u, \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) + T_\varepsilon \right) \\ &\geq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{E}^{0,B}(u - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u, \varphi_\varepsilon \circ u) + \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} T_\varepsilon \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $C_0^\infty(B)$ is dense in $D(\mathcal{E}^B)$ with respect to $\mathcal{E}^B(\cdot, \cdot)^{1/2} + \|\cdot\|_{L^2(B, \mu)}$, we conclude that $(\mathcal{E}^B, D(\mathcal{E}^B))$ is a Dirichlet form by [25, Chapter I, Proposition 4.10]. \square

Remark 3.3 Upon careful examination of the proof, it can be shown that even if condition (7) is replaced with the condition,

$$\int_B \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla \varphi \rangle d\mu \leq 0, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(B) \text{ with } \varphi \geq 0,$$

$(\mathcal{E}^B, D(\mathcal{E}^B))$ still remains a Dirichlet form.

From now on, under the assumption of **(Hyp)** with an open ball B in \mathbb{R}^d , additionally assume that $\operatorname{div} A \in L^d(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$. From Proposition 5.6, we can define an operator \mathcal{L}^B on $H^{2,2}(B)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^B f &= \operatorname{div}(A \nabla f) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla f \rangle \\ &= \operatorname{trace}(A \nabla^2 f) + \langle \operatorname{div} A + \mathbf{H}, \nabla f \rangle \\ &= \operatorname{trace}(A \nabla^2 f) + \left\langle \operatorname{div} A + \frac{1}{\rho} A^T \nabla \rho, \nabla f \right\rangle + \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla f \rangle, \quad f \in H^{2,2}(B), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where ρ and \mathbf{B} are defined as in Theorem 3.1 and (6), respectively. Then, $\mathcal{L}^B f \in L^2(B, \mu)$ for any $f \in H^{2,2}(B)$.

Theorem 3.4 Under the assumption **(Hyp)**, let $\rho \in H_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be as in Theorem 3.2, μ and \mathbf{B} be defined as in (6). Let B be an open ball in \mathbb{R}^d , $(\mathcal{E}^B, D(\mathcal{E}^B))$ be a Dirichlet form defined as in Theorem 3.2 and $(G_\alpha^B)_{\alpha > 0}$ be its corresponding sub-Markovian C_0 -resolvent of contractions on $L^2(B, \mu)$ (cf. [25, Chapter I, Theorem 2.8]). Suppose that $\operatorname{div} A \in L^d(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and let $\alpha > 0$ and $f \in L^2(B, \mu)$. Then $G_\alpha^B f \in H^{2,2}(B) \cap H_0^{1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(B)$.

Proof Let $\alpha > 0$ and $f \in L^2(B, \mu)$. By [25, Chapter I, Theorem 2.8], $G_\alpha f \in D(\mathcal{E}^B)$ and

$$\mathcal{E}^B(G_\alpha^B f, \varphi) + \alpha \int_B G_\alpha f \cdot \varphi d\mu = \int_B f \varphi d\mu, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in D(\mathcal{E}^B).$$

According to Theorem 3.2(iii), $G_\alpha^B f \in D(\mathcal{E}^B) = H_0^{1,2}(B)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_B \langle \rho A \nabla G_\alpha f, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx - \int_B \langle \rho \mathbf{B}, \nabla G_\alpha f \rangle \varphi dx + \int_B \alpha \rho G_\alpha f \cdot \varphi dx \\ &= \int_B \langle A \nabla G_\alpha f, \nabla \varphi \rangle d\mu - \int_B \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla G_\alpha f \rangle \varphi d\mu + \alpha \int_B G_\alpha f \cdot \varphi d\mu \\ &= \mathcal{E}^B(G_\alpha^B f, \varphi) + \alpha \int_B G_\alpha f \cdot \varphi d\mu = \int_B f \varphi d\mu = \int_B \rho f \varphi dx, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(B). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r > 0$ be such that $B = B_r(x_0)$. Let $\rho_e \in H^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)_0$ be an extension of $\rho \in H^{1,p}(B_{2r}(x_0))$ (cf. [15, Theorem 4.7]) satisfying that $\rho_e = \rho$ in $\overline{B}_{2r}(x_0)$ and $\operatorname{supp}(\rho_e) \subset B_{4r}(x_0)$. Take $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\chi(x) = 1$ for all $x \in \overline{B}_r(x_0)$, $\operatorname{supp}(\chi) \subset B_{2r}(x_0)$ and $0 \leq \chi(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Define a function $\tilde{\rho} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\tilde{\rho}(x) := \chi \left(\rho_e(x) - \min_{\overline{B}_{2r}(x_0)} \rho \right) + \min_{\overline{B}_{2r}(x_0)} \rho, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then, by Proposition 5.1, $\tilde{\rho} \in H^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)_0 \cap VMO \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and it satisfies $\tilde{\rho} = \rho$ in $\overline{B} = \overline{B}_r(x_0)$ and

$$\min_{\overline{B}_{2r}(x_0)} \rho \leq \tilde{\rho}(x) \leq \max_{\overline{B}_{2r}(x_0)} \rho, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Thus, we can rewrite (13) as

$$\int_B \langle \tilde{\rho} A \nabla G_\alpha^B f, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx - \int_B \langle \rho \mathbf{B}, \nabla G_\alpha^B f \rangle \varphi dx + \int_B \alpha \rho G_\alpha^B f \cdot \varphi dx = \int_B (\rho f) \varphi dx, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(B). \quad (14)$$

Note that by Proposition 5.1, $\tilde{\rho} a_{ij} \in VMO \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. Moreover,

$$\lambda \left(\min_{\overline{B}_{2r}(x_0)} \rho \right) \|\xi\|^2 \leq \langle \tilde{\rho} A(x) \xi, \xi \rangle, \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

$\rho \mathbf{B} \in L^p(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$, and $-\alpha \rho G_\alpha^B f + \rho f \in L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}(B)$. By using [20, Theorem 2.1(i)], there exists $u \in H_0^{1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(U)$ such that

$$\int_B \langle \tilde{\rho} A \nabla u, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx - \int_B \langle \rho \mathbf{B}, \nabla u \rangle \varphi dx = \int_B (-\alpha \rho G_\alpha^B f + \rho f) \varphi dx, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(B). \quad (15)$$

Applying the weak maximum principle in [34, Corollary 3.3] (cf. [35, Theorem 1]) to (14) and (15), we obtain that $G_\alpha^B f = u \in H_0^{1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(B)$. Now, let

$$g := \rho f + \langle A^T \nabla \rho + \rho \operatorname{div} A, \nabla G_\alpha^B f \rangle + \langle \rho \mathbf{B}, \nabla G_\alpha^B f \rangle - \alpha \rho G_\alpha^B f.$$

Then, $g \in L^2(B)$. Using [13, Theorem 4.4], there exists $v \in H^{2,2}(B) \cap H_0^{1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(B)$ such that

$$-\operatorname{trace}(\tilde{\rho} A \nabla^2 v) = g, \quad \text{on } B,$$

and hence using integration by parts in Proposition 5.7, we obtain that

$$\int_B \langle \rho A \nabla v, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx + \int_B \langle A^T \nabla \rho + \rho \operatorname{div} A, \nabla v \rangle \varphi dx = \int_B g \varphi dx, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(B).$$

Meanwhile, from (14)

$$\int_B \langle \rho A \nabla G_\alpha^B f, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx + \int_B \langle A^T \nabla \rho + \rho \operatorname{div} A, \nabla G_\alpha^B f \rangle \varphi dx = \int_B g \varphi dx, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(B).$$

By the consequence of the weak maximum principle in [34, Corollary 3.3] (cf. [35, Theorem 1]), we finally get $G_\alpha^B g = v \in H^{2,2}(B) \cap H_0^{1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(B)$, as desired. \square

Proposition 3.5 *Given the assumption (Hyp), let $\rho \in H_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be as in Theorem 3.2, μ and \mathbf{B} be defined as in (6). Let B be an open ball in \mathbb{R}^d , $(\mathcal{E}^B, D(\mathcal{E}^B))$ be a Dirichlet form defined as in Theorem 3.2 and $(L^B, D(L^B))$ be its corresponding generator on $L^2(B, \mu)$ (cf. [25, Chapter I, Corollary 2.10, Proposition 2.16]). Suppose that $\operatorname{div} A \in L_{loc}^d(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and let $u \in H^{2,2}(B) \cap H_0^{1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(B)$ and \mathcal{L}^B . Then, $u \in D(L^B)$ and $L^B u = \mathcal{L}^B u$, i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned} L^B u &= \operatorname{div}(A \nabla u) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla u \rangle \\ &= \operatorname{trace}(A \nabla^2 u) + \langle \operatorname{div} A + \mathbf{H}, \nabla u \rangle \\ &= \operatorname{trace}(A \nabla^2 u) + \left\langle \operatorname{div} A + \frac{1}{\rho} A^T \nabla \rho, \nabla u \right\rangle + \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla u \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Specifically,

$$\mathcal{E}^B(u, v) = - \int_B L^B u \cdot v d\mu = - \int_B \mathcal{L}^B u \cdot v d\mu, \quad \text{for all } v \in D(\mathcal{E}^B). \quad (16)$$

Proof Let $u \in H^{2,2}(B) \cap H_0^{1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(B)$. Then, $u \in D(\mathcal{E}^B) = H_0^{1,2}(B)$. Applying Theorem 3.2(iii) and Proposition 5.7, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^B(u, \varphi) &= \int_B \langle A \nabla u, \nabla \varphi \rangle d\mu - \int_B \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla u \rangle \varphi d\mu \\ &= - \int_B \left(\rho \operatorname{trace}(A \nabla^2 u) + \langle \rho \operatorname{div} A + A^T \nabla \rho, \nabla u \rangle \right) \varphi dx - \int_B \left\langle \mathbf{H} - \frac{1}{\rho} A^T \nabla \rho, \nabla u \right\rangle \varphi d\mu \\ &= - \int_B \left(\operatorname{trace}(A \nabla^2 u) + \langle \operatorname{div} A + \mathbf{H}, \nabla u \rangle \right) \varphi d\mu, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(B). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Consequently, (17) extends to all $\varphi \in D(\mathcal{E}^B)$ through approximation. Since

$$\operatorname{trace}(A \nabla^2 u) + \langle \operatorname{div} A + \mathbf{H}, \nabla u \rangle \in L^2(B, \mu),$$

we conclude from [25, Chapter I, Proposition 2.16] and Proposition 5.6 that the assertion is validated. \square

Proposition 3.6 *Under the assumption (Hyp), suppose that $\operatorname{div} A \in L^d(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Let $\chi \in C_0^\infty(B)$ and $u \in H^{2,2}(B) \cap H_0^{1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(B)$. Then, $\chi, u, \chi u \in H^{2,2}(B) \cap H_0^{1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(B) \subset D(L^B)$ (by Proposition 3.5) and*

$$L^B(\chi u) = u L^B \chi + \chi L^B u + \langle A \nabla \chi, \nabla u \rangle + \langle A \nabla u, \nabla \chi \rangle.$$

Proof First by the product rule and Sobolev's embedding, $\chi u \in H^{2,2}(U) \cap H_0^{1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(B)$. Thus, by Proposition 3.5, $\chi, u, \chi u \in H^{2,2}(B) \cap H_0^{1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(B) \subset D(L^B)$. Meanwhile, using Propositions 5.6 and 5.8,

$$\operatorname{div}(\chi A \nabla u) = \chi \operatorname{div}(A \nabla u) + \langle \nabla \chi, A \nabla u \rangle \in L^2(B)$$

and

$$\operatorname{div}(u A \nabla \chi) = u \operatorname{div}(A \nabla \chi) + \langle \nabla u, A \nabla \chi \rangle \in L^2(B).$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} L^B(\chi u) &= \operatorname{div}(A \nabla(\chi u)) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla(\chi u) \rangle \\ &= \operatorname{div}(\chi A \nabla u) + \operatorname{div}(u A \nabla \chi) + \chi \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla u \rangle + u \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla \chi \rangle \\ &= u \left(\operatorname{div}(A \nabla \chi) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla \chi \rangle \right) + \chi \left(\operatorname{div}(A \nabla u) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla u \rangle \right) + \langle A \nabla \chi, \nabla u \rangle + \langle A \nabla u, \nabla \chi \rangle \\ &= u L^B \chi + \chi L^B u + \langle A \nabla \chi, \nabla u \rangle + \langle A \nabla u, \nabla \chi \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

4 Main results

Theorem 4.1 *Assume that (Hyp) holds and let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $R > 0$. Suppose that $\operatorname{div} A \in L_{loc}^d(B_R(x_0), \mathbb{R}^d)$ and let $\tilde{h} \in L_{loc}^2(B_R(x_0))$, $c \in L_{loc}^d(B_R(x_0))$, $\tilde{f} \in L_{loc}^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}(B_R(x_0))$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{F}} \in L_{loc}^2(B_R(x_0), \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy that*

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} \left(\operatorname{div}(A \nabla u) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla u \rangle + cu \right) \tilde{h} dx = \int_{B_R(x_0)} \tilde{f} u dx + \int_{B_R(x_0)} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{F}}, \nabla u \rangle dx \quad \text{for all } u \in C_0^\infty(B_R(x_0)).$$

Then, $\tilde{h} \in H_{loc}^{1,2}(B_R(x_0))$.

Proof Consider an arbitrary $s \in (0, R)$. Choose $r \in (s, R)$ and write $B := B_r(x_0)$. Let $\chi \in C_0^\infty(B)$ with $\chi \equiv 1$ on $\overline{B}_s(x_0)$ and $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ on \mathbb{R}^d . To establish the assertion, it is enough to show that $\chi h \in D(\mathcal{E}^B) = H_0^{1,2}(B)$. Let $v \in H^{2,2}(B) \cap H_0^{1,2}(B)$ with $\text{supp}(v) \subset B$ be arbitrarily given. Utilizing mollification and the Sobolev embedding theorem, we can find a sequence $(v_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset C_0^\infty(B)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n = v \text{ in } H^{2,2}(B) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nabla v_n = \nabla v, \text{ in } L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}(B, \mathbb{R}^d), \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n = v \text{ in } L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}(B). \quad (18)$$

Observe that, according to Proposition 5.6,

$$\text{div}(A\nabla v) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla v \rangle = \text{trace}(A\nabla^2 v) + \langle \text{div} A + \mathbf{H}, \nabla v \rangle \in L^2(B).$$

Accordingly, through approximation in (18), we deduce that

$$\int_B \left(\text{div}(A\nabla v) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla v \rangle + cv \right) \tilde{h} dx = \int_B \tilde{f} v dx + \int_B \langle \tilde{\mathbf{F}}, \nabla v \rangle dx. \quad (19)$$

Consider $\rho \in H_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where $\rho(x) > 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, as defined in Theorem 3.1 and define μ, \mathbf{B} as in (6). Let $(\mathcal{E}^B, D(\mathcal{E}^B))$ and $(L^B, D(L^B))$ be as in Theorem 3.2 and Proposition 3.5, respectively. Let $h := \frac{\tilde{h}}{\rho} \in L^2(B, \mu)$, $f := \frac{\tilde{f}}{\rho} \in L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}(B, \mu)$ and $\mathbf{F} := \frac{1}{\rho} \tilde{\mathbf{F}} \in L^2(B, \mathbb{R}^d, \mu)$. Now, Proposition 3.5 and (19) imply that $v \in D(L^B)$ and

$$\int_B \left(L^B v + cv \right) h d\mu = \int_B f v + \langle \mathbf{F}, \nabla v \rangle d\mu. \quad (20)$$

Let $\alpha > 0$. Then, $G_\alpha^B h \in H^{2,2}(B) \cap H_0^{1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(B)$ by Theorem 3.4. Since $\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h \in H^{2,2}(B) \cap H_0^{1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(B)$ and has a compact support in B , replacing v with $\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h$ in (20), we obtain that

$$- \int_B L^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) \cdot h d\mu = \int_B c(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) h d\mu - \int_B f(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) - \int_B \langle \mathbf{F}, \nabla(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) \rangle d\mu. \quad (21)$$

Thus, by using Proposition 3.6 and the property that $(\alpha - L^B)G_\alpha^B h = h$ on B , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} L^B(\chi G_\alpha^B h) &= G_\alpha^B h L^B \chi + \chi L^B G_\alpha^B h + \langle A\nabla \chi, \nabla G_\alpha^B h \rangle + \langle A\nabla G_\alpha^B h, \nabla \chi \rangle \\ &= G_\alpha^B h L^B \chi + \chi(\alpha G_\alpha h - h) + \langle A\nabla \chi, \nabla G_\alpha^B h \rangle + \langle A\nabla G_\alpha^B h, \nabla \chi \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

By using (16) in Proposition 3.5 and (22), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) &= - \int_B L^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) \cdot \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h d\mu \\ &= - \int_B \alpha G_\alpha^B h \cdot (L^B \chi) \cdot \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h d\mu - \int_B \langle A\nabla \chi, \nabla \alpha G_\alpha^B h \rangle \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h d\mu - \int_B \langle A\nabla \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \nabla \chi \rangle \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h d\mu \\ &\quad - \alpha \int_B (\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h - \chi h) \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h d\mu \\ &= - \int_B \alpha G_\alpha^B h \cdot (L^B \chi) \cdot \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h d\mu - \int_B \langle A\nabla \chi, \nabla(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) \rangle \alpha G_\alpha^B h d\mu - \int_B \langle A\nabla(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h), \nabla \chi \rangle \alpha G_\alpha^B h d\mu \\ &\quad + 2 \int_B \langle A\nabla \chi, \nabla \chi \rangle (\alpha G_\alpha^B h)^2 d\mu - \alpha \int_B (\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h - \chi h) \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h d\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

First, by the Hölder inequality and the Sobolev inequality (cf. [15, Theorem 4.8]),

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_B \alpha G_\alpha^B h \cdot (L^B \chi) \cdot \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h d\mu &\leq \|\alpha G_\alpha^B h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)} \|L^B \chi\|_{L^d(B, \mu)} \|\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}(B, \mu)} \\ &\leq \underbrace{\|h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)} \|L^B \chi\|_{L^d(B, \mu)} K_{d, \rho}}_{=: c_1} \mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $K_{d,\rho} := \frac{(\max_{\overline{B}} \rho)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{d}}}{\lambda^{1/2}(\min_{\overline{B}} \rho)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot \frac{2(d-1)}{d-2}$. Using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, the Hölder inequality, the Sobolev inequality and the $L^2(B, \mu)$ -contraction property of $(G_\alpha^B)_{\alpha>0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_B \langle A \nabla \chi, \nabla(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) \rangle \alpha G_\alpha^B h d\mu &\leq \int_B \langle A \nabla \chi, \nabla \chi \rangle^{1/2} \langle A \nabla \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \nabla \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h \rangle^{1/2} |\alpha G_\alpha^B h| d\mu \\ &\leq (dM)^{1/2} \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^\infty(B)} \mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha h)^{1/2} \|\alpha G_\alpha^B h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)} \\ &\leq \underbrace{(dM)^{1/2} \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^\infty(B)} \|h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)}}_{=:c_2} \mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha h)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_B \langle A \nabla(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h), \nabla \chi \rangle \alpha G_\alpha^B h d\mu &= - \int_B \langle A^T \nabla \chi, \nabla(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) \rangle \alpha G_\alpha^B h d\mu \\ &\leq c_2 \mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha h)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, applying the $L^2(B, \mu)$ -contraction property of $(G_\alpha^B)_{\alpha>0}$,

$$2 \int_B \langle A \nabla \chi, \nabla \chi \rangle (\alpha G_\alpha^B h)^2 d\mu \leq \int 2dM \|\nabla \chi\|^2 (\alpha G_\alpha^B h)^2 d\mu \leq \underbrace{2dM \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^\infty(B)}^2 \|h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)}^2}_{=:c_3}.$$

Furthermore, through straightforward computation

$$-\alpha \left(\int_B (\alpha G_\alpha^B h - h) \alpha G_\alpha^B h \cdot \chi^2 d\mu - \int_B (\alpha G_\alpha^B h - h) h \cdot \chi^2 d\mu \right) = -\alpha \int_B (\alpha G_\alpha^B h - h)^2 \chi^2 d\mu \leq 0,$$

and hence

$$-\alpha \int_B (\alpha G_\alpha^B h - h) \alpha G_\alpha^B h \cdot \chi^2 d\mu \leq -\alpha \int_B (\alpha G_\alpha^B h - h) h \cdot \chi^2 d\mu. \quad (24)$$

Since $(\alpha - L^B)(\alpha G_\alpha^B h) = \alpha h$, we have $-\alpha(\alpha G_\alpha^B h - h) = -L^B(\alpha G_\alpha^B h)$. Thus, applying Proposition 3.6, (21) to (24), we discover that

$$\begin{aligned} -\alpha \int_B (\alpha G_\alpha^B h - h) \alpha G_\alpha^B h \cdot \chi^2 d\mu &\leq -\alpha \int_B (\alpha G_\alpha^B h - h) h \chi^2 d\mu = \int_B -L^B(\alpha G_\alpha^B h) \cdot h \chi^2 d\mu \\ &= \int_B -L^B(\chi^2 \alpha G_\alpha^B h) \cdot h d\mu + \int_B \alpha G_\alpha^B h \cdot (L^B \chi^2) h d\mu + \int_B \langle A \nabla \chi^2, \nabla \alpha G_\alpha^B h \rangle h d\mu + \int_B \langle A \nabla \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \nabla \chi^2 \rangle h d\mu \\ &= \int_B c(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) h d\mu - \int_B f(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) d\mu - \int_B \langle \mathbf{F}, \nabla(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) \rangle d\mu \\ &\quad + \int_B \alpha G_\alpha^B h \cdot (L^B \chi^2) h d\mu + \int_B \langle A \nabla \chi^2, \nabla \alpha G_\alpha^B h \rangle h d\mu + \int_B \langle A \nabla \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \nabla \chi^2 \rangle h d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

By the Hölder inequality and the Sobolev inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B c(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) h d\mu &\leq \|c\|_{L^d(B, \mu)} \|\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}(B, \mu)} \|h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)} \\ &\leq \underbrace{\|c\|_{L^d(B, \mu)} \|h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)} K_{d,\rho}}_{=:c_4} \mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_B f(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) d\mu &\leq \|f\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}(B, \mu)} \|\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}(B, \mu)} \\ &\leq \underbrace{\|f\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+2}}(B, \mu)} K_{d,r,\rho}}_{=:c_5} \mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_B \langle \mathbf{F}, \nabla(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) \rangle d\mu &\leq \|\mathbf{F}\|_{L^2(B, \mu)} \|\nabla \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)} \\ &\leq \underbrace{\|\mathbf{F}\|_{L^2(B, \mu)} \lambda^{-1/2}}_{=: c_6} \mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, by Proposition 3.6 and using the Hölder inequality, the Sobolev inequality and the $L^2(B, \mu)$ -contraction property of $(G_\alpha^B)_{\alpha>0}$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B \alpha G_\alpha^B h \cdot (L^B \chi^2) h d\mu &= \int_B \alpha G_\alpha^B h \cdot (2\chi L^B \chi) h d\mu + \int_B \alpha G_\alpha^B h \cdot 2\langle A \nabla \chi, \nabla \chi \rangle h d\mu \\ &\leq \|\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}(B, \mu)} \|2L^B \chi\|_{L^d(B, \mu)} \|h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)} + 2dM \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^\infty(B)}^2 \|\alpha G_\alpha^B h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)} \|h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)} \\ &\leq \underbrace{K_{d, \rho} \|2L^B \chi\|_{L^d(B, \mu)} \|h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)}}_{=: c_7} \mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h)^{1/2} + \underbrace{2dM \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^\infty(B)}^2 \|h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)}^2}_{=: c_8}. \end{aligned}$$

From the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, the Hölder inequality and the Sobolev inequality, and the $L^2(B, \mu)$ -contraction property of $(G_\alpha^B)_{\alpha>0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B \langle A \nabla \chi^2, \nabla \alpha G_\alpha^B h \rangle h d\mu &= \int_B 2\langle A \nabla \chi, \chi \nabla \alpha G_\alpha^B h \rangle h d\mu \\ &= \int_B 2\langle A \nabla \chi, \nabla(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) \rangle h d\mu - \int_B 2\langle A \nabla \chi, \nabla \chi \rangle (\alpha G_\alpha^B h) h d\mu \\ &\leq \int_B 2\langle A \nabla(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h), \nabla(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) \rangle^{1/2} \langle A \nabla \chi, \nabla \chi \rangle^{1/2} |h| d\mu \\ &\quad + 2dM \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^\infty(B)}^2 \|\alpha G_\alpha^B h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)} \|h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)} \\ &\leq \underbrace{2(dM)^{1/2} \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^\infty(B)} \|h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)}}_{=: c_9} \mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h)^{1/2} + \underbrace{2dM \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^\infty(B)}^2 \|h\|_{L^2(B, \mu)}^2}_{=: c_{10}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B \langle A \nabla \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \nabla \chi^2 \rangle h d\mu &= \int_B \langle A^T \nabla \chi^2, \nabla \alpha G_\alpha^B h \rangle h d\mu \\ &\leq c_9 \mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h)^{1/2} + c_{10}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (23) deduces that

$$\mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) \leq C_1 \mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h)^{1/2} + C_2$$

where $C_1 = c_1 + 2c_2 + c_4 + c_5 + c_6 + c_7 + 2c_9$ and $C_2 = c_3 + c_8 + 2c_{10}$. Thus, Young's inequality implies that

$$\mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) \leq C_1^2 + 2C_2.$$

Given that $C_1^2 + 2C_2 > 0$ is a constant independent of $\alpha > 0$, it follows that

$$\sup_{\alpha>0} \mathcal{E}^B(\chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h, \chi \alpha G_\alpha^B h) \leq C_1^2 + 2C_2.$$

Using the Banach-Alaoglu theorem, there exist $v \in D(\mathcal{E}^B)$ and a strictly increasing sequence $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 1} \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \chi \alpha_k G_{\alpha_k}^B h = v, \quad \text{weakly in } (D(\mathcal{E}^B), \|\cdot\|_{D(\mathcal{E}^B)}),$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{D(\mathcal{E}^B)}$ is defined as $\|w\|_{D(\mathcal{E}^B)} := \mathcal{E}^B(w, w)^{1/2} + \|w\|_{L^2(B, \mu)}$, $w \in D(\mathcal{E}^B)$. On the other hand, by the strong continuity of $(G_\alpha^B)_{\alpha>0}$ on $L^2(B, \mu)$ we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \chi \alpha_k G_{\alpha_k}^B h = \chi h$ in $L^2(B, \mu)$. Thus, $\chi h = v \in D(\mathcal{E}^B) = H_0^{1,2}(B)$. Therefore, by Lemma 5.12(i) $\chi \tilde{h} = \rho(\chi h) \in H_0^{1,2}(B)$, as desired. \square

Theorem 4.2 Assume that **(Hyp)** holds. Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $R > 0$ and $q \in [2, \infty)$. Suppose that $\operatorname{div} A \in L_{loc}^d(B_R(x_0), \mathbb{R}^d)$, $\tilde{h} \in L_{loc}^2(B_R(x_0))$, $c \in L_{loc}^d(B_R(x_0))$, $\tilde{f} \in L_{loc}^{\frac{qd}{d+q}}(B_R(x_0))$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{F}} \in L_{loc}^q(B_R(x_0), \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} \left(\operatorname{div}(A \nabla u) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla u \rangle + cu \right) \tilde{h} dx = \int_{B_R(x_0)} \tilde{f} u dx + \int_{B_R(x_0)} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{F}}, \nabla u \rangle dx \quad \text{for all } u \in C_0^\infty(B_R(x_0)).$$

Then, $\frac{\tilde{h}}{\rho} \in H_{loc}^{1,p \wedge q}(B_R(x_0))$. In particular, $\tilde{h} \in H_{loc}^{1,p \wedge q}(B_R(x_0))$.

Proof By Theorem 4.1, $\tilde{h} \in H_{loc}^{1,2}(B_R(x_0))$. Consider an arbitrary $s_0 \in (0, R)$ and select $s \in (s_0, R)$ and $r \in (s, R)$. Write $B := B_r(x_0)$. Let $\chi \in C_0^\infty(B)$ with $\chi \equiv 1$ on $\overline{B}_s(x_0)$ and $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ on \mathbb{R}^d . To establish the assertion, it suffices to demonstrate that $\tilde{h} \in H^{1,p \wedge q}(B_{s_0}(x_0))$. Let $\rho \in H_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\rho(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be as in Theorem 3.1 and define μ, \mathbf{B} as in (6). Let $(\mathcal{E}^B, D(\mathcal{E}^B))$ and $(L^B, D(L^B))$ be as in Theorem 3.2 and Proposition 3.5, respectively. Define $h := \frac{\tilde{h}}{\rho} \in H^{1,2}(B)$, $f := \frac{\tilde{f}}{\rho} \in L^{\frac{qd}{d+q}}(B)$, and $\mathbf{F} := \frac{1}{\rho} \tilde{\mathbf{F}} \in L^q(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Now let $u \in C_0^\infty(B_s)$ be arbitrarily chosen. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_B \left(\operatorname{div}(A \nabla u) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla u \rangle + cu \right) (\chi h) d\mu = - \int_B \left(\operatorname{div}(A \nabla u) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla u \rangle + cu \right) h dx \\ & = - \int_B \tilde{f} u dx - \int_B \langle \tilde{\mathbf{F}}, \nabla u \rangle dx = - \int_B f u d\mu - \int_B \langle \mathbf{F}, \nabla u \rangle d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Given that $\chi u \in C_0^\infty(B_s(x_0)) \subset H_0^{1,2}(B) = D(\mathcal{E}^B)$, it follows from Proposition 3.5 and Theorem 3.2(iii),

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_B f u d\mu - \int_B \langle \mathbf{F}, \nabla u \rangle d\mu \\ & = - \int_B \left(\operatorname{div}(A \nabla u) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla u \rangle + cu \right) (\chi h) d\mu = - \int_B L^B u \cdot (\chi h) d\mu - \int_B cu(\chi h) d\mu \\ & = \mathcal{E}^B(u, \chi h) - \int_B cu(\chi h) d\mu = \int_B \langle A \nabla u, \nabla(\chi h) \rangle d\mu - \int_B \langle \mathbf{B}, \nabla u \rangle \chi h d\mu - \int_B cu(\chi h) d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(B_s(x_0))$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_s(x_0)} \langle \rho A^T \nabla h, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx + \int_{B_s(x_0)} \langle \rho \mathbf{B}, \nabla h \rangle \varphi dx + \int_{B_s(x_0)} -\rho c h \varphi dx \\ & = \int_{B_s(x_0)} -\rho f \varphi dx + \int_{B_s(x_0)} \langle -\rho \mathbf{F}, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Let $\hat{p} := p \wedge q$. Then, $-\rho \mathbf{B} \in L^{\hat{p}}(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $-\rho c \in L^{\frac{d\hat{p}}{d+\hat{p}}}(B_s(x_0))$, $-\rho f \in L^{\frac{d\hat{p}}{d+\hat{p}}}(B_s(x_0))$ and $-\rho \mathbf{F} \in L^{\hat{p}}(B_s(x_0), \mathbb{R}^d)$. By applying [6, Theorem 1.8.3] to (25), we conclude that $h \in H^{1,\hat{p}}(B_{r_0}(x_0))$. Finally, we establish from Lemma 5.12(ii) that $\tilde{h} = \rho h \in H^{1,p \wedge \hat{p}}(B_{r_0}(x_0)) = H^{1,\hat{p}}(B_{r_0}(x_0))$, completing the proof. \square

Remark 4.3 In Theorem 4.2, one can directly obtain from Theorem 4.1 and integration by parts that $\tilde{h} \in H_{loc}^{1,2}(B_R(x_0))$ satisfies

$$\int_U \langle A^T \nabla \tilde{h}, \nabla \varphi \rangle - \langle \tilde{h} \mathbf{H}, \nabla \varphi \rangle + c \tilde{h} \varphi dx = \int_{B_R(x_0)} \tilde{f} \varphi dx + \int_{B_R(x_0)} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{F}}, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(B_R(x_0)). \quad (26)$$

Applying [6, Theorem 1.8.3] to (26), we directly discover that $\tilde{h} \in H_{loc}^{1,p \wedge q}(B_R(x_0))$. Of course, this approach is easier than the proof of Theorem 4.2, but we mention that the divergence type equation in (25) presents meaningful input for the local regularity of solutions. For instance, in (25) $\frac{\tilde{h}}{\rho} = h$ may have $H_{loc}^{2,p \wedge q}(B_R(x_0))$ -regularity under additional conditions on the coefficients (cf. [20, Theorem 2.2]). On the other hand, (26) may not give this regularity result directly.

Proof of Theorem 1.1

Consider an arbitrary point $x_0 \in U$. Then, there exists $R_0 > 0$ such that $\overline{B_{R_0}}(x_0) \subset U$. Choose $R \in (0, R_0)$. To establish the assertion, it is enough to show that $h \in H_{loc}^{1,p \wedge q}(B_R(x_0))$. Let $\chi \in C_0^\infty(B_{R_0}(x_0))$ be such that $\chi \equiv 1$ on $B_R(x_0)$ and $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ on \mathbb{R}^d . Since $a_{ij} \in VMO(B_{R_0}(x_0))$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, by Lemma 5.2 there exists $\hat{a}_{ij} \in VMO \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for each $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ such that $\hat{a}_{ij} = a_{ij}$ on $B_{R_0}(x_0)$. Let $\hat{A} = (\hat{a}_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$. We define a matrix of functions $\overline{A} = (\overline{a}_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ as follows:

$$\overline{A} = \chi(\hat{A} - \lambda_{B_{R_0}(x_0)} id) + \lambda_{B_{R_0}(x_0)} id,$$

where id denotes the $d \times d$ identity matrix. Then, first by Proposition 5.1, $\overline{a}_{ij} \in VMO \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. Moreover, $\overline{a}_{ij}(x) = \hat{a}_{ij}(x) = a_{ij}(x)$ for all $x \in B_R(x_0)$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ and

$$\lambda_{B_{R_0}(x_0)} \|\xi\|^2 \leq \langle \overline{A}(x)\xi, \xi \rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} |\overline{a}_{ij}(x)| \leq M_{B_{R_0}(x_0)} + 2\lambda_{B_{R_0}(x_0)} \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Since $\text{div} \overline{A} = \text{div} A \in L^d(B_R(x_0), \mathbb{R}^d)$ on $B_R(x_0)$, it follows for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(B_R(x_0))$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{div}(\overline{A}\nabla\varphi) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla\varphi \rangle &= \text{trace}(\overline{A}\nabla^2\varphi) + \langle \text{div} \overline{A} + \mathbf{H}, \nabla\varphi \rangle \\ &= \text{trace}(A\nabla^2\varphi) + \langle \text{div} A + \mathbf{H}, \nabla\varphi \rangle = \mathcal{L}\varphi, \quad \text{on } B_R(x_0). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, (3) leads to

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} \left(\text{div}(\overline{A}\nabla\varphi) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla\varphi \rangle + c\varphi \right) h dx = \int_{B_R(x_0)} f\varphi dx + \int_{B_R(x_0)} \langle \mathbf{F}, \nabla\varphi \rangle dx \quad \text{for all } u \in C_0^\infty(B_R(x_0)). \quad (27)$$

Observe that the condition **(Hyp)** from Section 3 remains valid when A is replaced by \overline{A} . Thus, by applying Theorem 4.2 to (27), we conclude that the assertion holds. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.2

Let $\mathbf{H} := \mathbf{G} - \text{div} A$. Since $\mathbf{G} \in L_{loc}^p(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $p \in (d, \infty)$ and $\text{div} A \in L_{loc}^p(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$, it follows that $\mathbf{H} \in L_{loc}^p(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover, for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(U)$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}\varphi = \text{trace}(A\nabla^2\varphi) + \langle \mathbf{G}, \nabla\varphi \rangle \quad \text{for any } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(U).$$

Therefore, the result follows directly from Theorem 1.1. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.3

First by [7, Theorem 2.1], there exists $h \in L_{loc}^2(U)$ such that $\nu = hdx$. Applying Corollary 1.2 with $q = p$, $\mathbf{F} = 0$ and $f = 0$, we find that $h \in H_{loc}^{1,p}(U) \cap C_{loc}^{0,1-d/p}(U)$, as desired. \square

Example 4.4 (i) Define a function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\phi(x) := 2 + \|x\|^2 + \cos \left(\ln \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{\|x\|} \right) \right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}, \quad \phi(0) := 0.$$

It has been shown in [24] that $\phi \in H_{loc}^{1,d}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\phi \geq 1$ on \mathbb{R}^d , but $\phi \notin C(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Consequently, $\nabla\phi \notin L_{loc}^r(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ for any $r \in (1, \infty)$.

Now, define a matrix of functions $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ by setting $A(x) = \phi(x) id$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $p \in (d, \infty)$, and let $\mathbf{H} \in L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ be an arbitrary vector field. Consider the diffusion operator $(\mathcal{L}, C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$, defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}f := \text{div}(A\nabla f) + \langle \mathbf{H}, \nabla f \rangle = \text{trace}(A\nabla^2 f) + \langle \text{div} A + \mathbf{H}, \nabla f \rangle, \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

By Proposition 5.4, this simplifies to

$$\mathcal{L}f = \phi \Delta f + \langle \nabla \phi + \mathbf{H}, \nabla f \rangle, \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

The diffusion coefficient of \mathcal{L} is ϕid , whose components are not continuous. The drift coefficient of \mathcal{L} is $\nabla \phi + \mathbf{H} \in L_{loc}^d(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, but $\nabla \phi + \mathbf{H} \notin L_{loc}^r(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ for any $r \in (d, \infty)$. Our main result, Theorem 1.1, provides new insights into the regularity of the density of the infinitesimally invariant measure for $(\mathcal{L}, C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$. For instance, if a measure $\nu = h dx$, with $h \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, is an infinitesimally invariant measure for $(\mathcal{L}, C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$, i.e.,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{L}f d\nu = 0, \quad \text{for all } f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

then Theorem 1.1 implies that $h \in H_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C_{loc}^{0,1-d/p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. This result may not be derived using the results in [6, 7].

- (ii) Let $\eta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function that is not absolutely continuous (e.g., $\eta(x) := x \sin(\frac{1}{x})$ for $x > 0$ and $\eta(x) := 0$ for $x \leq 0$). Define $\phi(x) := \exp(\eta(x))$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, ϕ is a continuous function with $\phi(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, but ϕ is not absolutely continuous, so that $\phi \notin H_{loc}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$.

Define a matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ by

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ \phi(x_{i+1}) & \text{if } i = j \text{ and } i < d, \\ \phi(x_1) & \text{if } i = j = d. \end{cases}$$

Then $a_{ii} \notin H_{loc}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, but it holds that $\text{div} A = 0$. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{H}} \in L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $p \in (d, \infty)$ be given. Define the operator $(L, C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ given by

$$Lf = \frac{1}{2} \text{trace}(A \nabla^2 f) + \langle \tilde{\mathbf{H}}, \nabla f \rangle, \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

If a measure $\nu = h dx$, with $h \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, is an infinitesimally invariant measure for $(L, C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$, i.e.

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Lf d\nu = 0, \quad \text{for all } f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

then Corollary 1.2 implies that $h \in H_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C_{loc}^{0,1-d/p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. This result also may not be derived using the results in [6, 7]. It is remarkable that the density h of ν is locally Hölder continuous even though the components a_{ii} of A are not locally Hölder continuous.

5 Auxiliary results

Proposition 5.1 *Let $d \geq 1$. If $f, g \in VMO \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then $fg \in VMO \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Proof Let $f, g \in VMO \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, there exist positive functions ω_1 and ω_2 on $[0, \infty)$ with $\omega_1(0) = \omega_2(0) = 0$ such that

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d, r < R} r^{-2d} \int_{B_r(z)} \int_{B_r(z)} |f(x) - f(y)| dx dy \leq \omega_1(R), \quad \text{for every } R > 0$$

and

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d, r < R} r^{-2d} \int_{B_r(z)} \int_{B_r(z)} |g(x) - g(y)| dx dy \leq \omega_2(R), \quad \text{for every } R > 0.$$

Let $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $R > 0$. Choose $r \in (0, R)$. Then for each $x, y \in B_r(z)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x)g(x) - f(y)g(y)| &\leq |f(x)g(x) - f(x)g(y)| + |f(x)g(y) - f(y)g(y)| \\ &\leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}|g(x) - g(y)| + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}|f(x) - f(y)|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it follows that

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d, r < R} r^{-2d} \int_{B_r(z)} \int_{B_r(z)} |f(x)g(x) - f(y)g(y)| dx dy \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \omega_2(R) + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \omega_1(R),$$

as desired. □

Lemma 5.2 *Let B be an open ball in \mathbb{R}^d with $d \geq 1$ and $f \in VMO(B) \cap L^\infty(B)$. Then, there exists $\hat{f} \in VMO \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\hat{f}|_B = f$.*

Proof Since $f \in VMO(B)$, there exists $\tilde{f} \in VMO$ such that $\tilde{f}|_B = f$. In particular, there exists a positive continuous function ω on $[0, \infty)$ such that

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d, r < R} r^{-2d} \int_{B_r(z)} \int_{B_r(z)} |\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(y)| dx dy \leq \omega(R), \quad \text{for every } R > 0.$$

Let $M := \|f\|_{L^\infty(B)}$ and choose $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\eta(t) = t$ for any $t \in [-M - 1, M + 1]$ and $\eta(t) = 0$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (-2M - 2, 2M + 2)$. Define $\hat{f} := \eta \circ \tilde{f}$. Then, $\hat{f} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\hat{f}|_B = f$. Now, let $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $R > 0$. Choose $r \in (0, R)$. Then for each $x, y \in B_r(z)$, by the mean value theorem

$$|\hat{f}(x) - \hat{f}(y)| = |(\eta \circ \tilde{f})(x) - (\eta \circ \tilde{f})(y)| \leq \|\eta'\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} |\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(y)|.$$

Therefore, for every $R > 0$

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d, r < R} r^{-2d} \int_{B_r(z)} \int_{B_r(z)} |\hat{f}(x) - \hat{f}(y)| dx dy \leq \|\eta'\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \omega(R),$$

and hence $\hat{f} \in VMO$, as wished. □

Proposition 5.3 *Let U be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d with $d \geq 1$ and $f, g \in VMO_{loc}(U) \cap L^\infty_{loc}(U)$. Then, $fg \in VMO_{loc}(U) \cap L^\infty_{loc}(U)$.*

Proof Let B be an open ball in \mathbb{R}^d with $\overline{B} \subset U$. Then, $f, g \in VMO(B) \cap L^\infty(B)$. By Lemma 5.2, there exists $\hat{f}, \hat{g} \in VMO \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\hat{f}|_B = f$ and $\hat{g}|_B = g$. By Proposition 5.1, $\hat{f}\hat{g} \in VMO \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Since, $\hat{f}\hat{g}|_B = fg$, the assertion follows. □

Proposition 5.4 *Let U be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d with $d \geq 2$, $B = (b_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ be a matrix of locally integrable functions on U and $\mathbf{E} = (e_1, \dots, e_d) \in L^1_{loc}(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $\text{div} B = \mathbf{E}$. Let $\Phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_d) \in C_0^\infty(U)^d$ be arbitrary and V be an open set in \mathbb{R}^d such that $\text{supp } \phi_j \subset V \subset \overline{V} \subset U$ for any $j = 1, \dots, d$. Let $B_n = (b_{ij}^n)_{1 \leq i, j \leq d, n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of matrices of functions in $C^1(\overline{V})$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_{ij}^n = b_{ij}$ weakly in $L^1(V)$ for each $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. Then,*

$$\int_U \langle \text{div} B, \Phi \rangle dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_U \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \partial_i b_{ij}^n \right) \phi_j dx.$$

Proof By the definition of $\operatorname{div}B$ and the conditions above, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U \langle \operatorname{div}B, \Phi \rangle dx &= \int_U \sum_{j=1}^d e_j \phi_j dx = - \int_U \sum_{i,j=1}^d b_{ij} \partial_i \phi_j dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} - \int_U \sum_{i,j=1}^d b_{ij}^n \partial_i \phi_j dx \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_U \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \partial_i b_{ij}^n \right) \phi_j dx, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Proposition 5.5 *Let U be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d with $d \geq 2$, $\mathbf{F} \in L^1_{\operatorname{loc}}(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f \in L^1_{\operatorname{loc}}(U)$ be such that $\operatorname{div}\mathbf{F} = f$. Let $\phi \in C_0^\infty(U)$ be arbitrary and V be an open set in \mathbb{R}^d such that $\operatorname{supp}\phi \subset V \subset \overline{V} \subset U$. Let $(\mathbf{F}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of vector fields in $C^1(\overline{V}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{F}_n = \mathbf{F}$ weakly in $L^1(V, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then,*

$$\int_U \operatorname{div}\mathbf{F} \cdot \phi dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_U \operatorname{div}\mathbf{F}_n \cdot \phi dx.$$

Proof By the definition, we directly get

$$\int_U \operatorname{div}\mathbf{F} \cdot \phi dx = - \int_U \langle \mathbf{F}, \nabla \phi \rangle dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} - \int_U \langle \mathbf{F}_n, \nabla \phi \rangle dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_U \operatorname{div}\mathbf{F}_n \cdot \phi dx.$$

□

Proposition 5.6 *Let $d \geq 2$, U be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d , $u \in H^{2,1}_{\operatorname{loc}}(U)$ with $\nabla u \in L^2_{\operatorname{loc}}(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$, and $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i,j \leq d}$ be a matrix of functions in $L^\infty_{\operatorname{loc}}(U)$ with $\operatorname{div}A \in L^2_{\operatorname{loc}}(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then,*

$$\operatorname{div}(A\nabla u) = \operatorname{trace}(A\nabla^2 u) + \langle \operatorname{div}A, \nabla u \rangle \quad \text{in } U.$$

Proof Let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(U)$ be fixed. Choose an open set V in \mathbb{R}^d such that $\operatorname{supp}(\varphi) \subset V \subset \overline{V} \subset U$. Through a mollification, let $A_n = (a_{ij}^n)_{1 \leq i,j \leq d, n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of matrices of functions in $C_0^\infty(\overline{V})$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_{ij}^n = a_{ij}, \quad \text{in } L^1(V) \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq d.$$

By a mollification and Sobolev's embedding, there exists $(u_m)_{m \geq 1} \subset C^\infty(\overline{V})$ such that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} u_m = u \quad \text{in } H^{2,1}(V), \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nabla u_m = \nabla u \quad \text{in } L^2(V, \mathbb{R}^d).$$

By Proposition 5.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U \langle A\nabla u, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_U \langle A\nabla u_m, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} - \int_U \langle A_n \nabla u_m, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} - \int_U \operatorname{trace}(A_n \nabla^2 u_m) \varphi + \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \partial_i a_{ij}^n \right) \varphi \partial_j u_m dx \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} - \int_U \operatorname{trace}(A \nabla^2 u_m) \varphi + \langle \operatorname{div}A, \nabla u_m \rangle dx \\ &= - \int_U \left(\operatorname{trace}(A \nabla^2 u) + \langle \operatorname{div}A, \nabla u \rangle \right) \varphi dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(U)$ is arbitrarily chosen, the assertion follows. □

Proposition 5.7 Let $d \geq 2$, U be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d , $\rho \in H_{loc}^{1,2}(U) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(U)$, and $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ be a matrix of functions in $L_{loc}^\infty(U)$ with $\operatorname{div} A \in L_{loc}^2(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then,

$$\operatorname{div}(\rho A) = \rho \operatorname{div} A + A^T \nabla \rho \in L_{loc}^2(U, \mathbb{R}^d) \quad (28)$$

In particular, if $u \in H_{loc}^{2,1}(U)$ with $\nabla u \in L_{loc}^2(U)$, then

$$\int_U \langle \rho A \nabla u, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx = - \int_U \operatorname{trace}(\rho A \nabla^2 u) + \langle \rho \operatorname{div} A + A^T \nabla \rho, \nabla u \rangle dx, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(U)$$

Proof Let $\Phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_d) \in C_0^\infty(U)^d$ be fixed. Choose an open set V in \mathbb{R}^d such that $\operatorname{supp}(\phi_i) \subset V \subset \bar{V} \subset U$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$. Through a mollification, choose a sequence of matrices of functions $(a_{n,ij})_{n \geq 1, 1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ in $C^\infty(\bar{V})$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_{n,ij} = a_{ij}$ in $L^1(V)$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. Then, by Proposition 5.4

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U \sum_{i,j=1}^d \rho a_{ij} \partial_i \phi_j dx &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_U \sum_{i,j=1}^d \rho_m a_{n,ij} \partial_i \phi_j dx \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} - \int_U \sum_{i,j=1}^d \phi_j a_{n,ij} \partial_i \rho_m + \rho_m \phi_j \partial_i a_{n,ij} dx \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} - \int_U \sum_{i,j=1}^d \phi_j a_{ij} \partial_i \rho_m + \langle \operatorname{div} A, \rho_m \Phi \rangle dx \\ &= - \int_U \langle A^T \nabla \rho + \rho \operatorname{div} A, \Phi \rangle dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (28) follows. Now, let $u \in H_{loc}^{2,2}(U)$ and $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(U)$. As a consequence of Proposition 5.6 and (28), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U \langle \rho A \nabla u, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx &= - \int_U \left(\operatorname{trace}(\rho A \nabla^2 u) + \langle \operatorname{div}(\rho A), \nabla u \rangle \right) \varphi dx \\ &= - \int_U \left(\operatorname{trace}(\rho A \nabla^2 u) + \langle \rho \operatorname{div} A + A^T \nabla \rho, \nabla u \rangle \right) \varphi dx, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Proposition 5.8 Let $d \geq 2$, U be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d , $u \in H_{loc}^{1,2}(U)$ and $\mathbf{F} \in L_{loc}^2(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{F} \in L_{loc}^2(U)$. Then,

$$\operatorname{div}(u \mathbf{F}) = \langle \nabla u, \mathbf{F} \rangle + u \cdot \operatorname{div} \mathbf{F} \quad \text{in } U.$$

Proof Let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(U)$ be an arbitrarily given. Choose an open set V in \mathbb{R}^d such that $\operatorname{supp}(\varphi) \subset V \subset \bar{V} \subset U$. Observe that there exists a sequence of vector fields $(\mathbf{F}_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset C_0^\infty(V, \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{F}_n = \mathbf{F}$ in $L^2(V, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover, through a mollification, there exists a sequence of functions $(u_m)_{m \geq 1} \subset C^\infty(\bar{V})$ such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} u_m = u$ in $H^{1,2}(V)$. Thus, we obtain from Proposition 5.5 that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U \langle u \mathbf{F}, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_U \langle u_m \mathbf{F}_n, \nabla \varphi \rangle dx = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} - \int_U \langle \nabla u_m, \mathbf{F}_n \rangle \varphi + u_m \varphi \operatorname{div} \mathbf{F}_n dx \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} - \int_U \left(\langle \nabla u_m, \mathbf{F} \rangle + u_m \operatorname{div} \mathbf{F} \right) \varphi dx = - \int_U \left(\langle \nabla u, \mathbf{F} \rangle + u \cdot \operatorname{div} \mathbf{F} \right) \varphi dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the assertion follows. □

Proposition 5.9 Let η be a standard mollifier on \mathbb{R} , i.e.

$$\eta(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\int_{(-1,1)} e^{\frac{1}{s^2-1}} ds} e^{\frac{1}{t^2-1}}, & \text{if } |t| < 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } |t| \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $\eta_\varepsilon(t) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \eta\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)$, and $\psi_\varepsilon(t) := (t \wedge (1 + \varepsilon)) \vee (-\varepsilon)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Define $\varphi_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ given by

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(t) := \eta_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} * \psi_\varepsilon(t) = \int_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \eta_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(s) \psi_\varepsilon(t-s) ds, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}$$

Then, $\varphi_\varepsilon(t) \in [-\varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon]$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$0 \leq \varphi_\varepsilon(t_2) - \varphi_\varepsilon(t_1) \leq t_2 - t_1, \quad \text{for all } t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R} \text{ with } t_1 \leq t_2,$$

so that $\varphi'_\varepsilon(t) \in [0, 1]$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, $\varphi_\varepsilon(t) = t$ for all $t \in [-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}]$, $\varphi_\varepsilon(t) = -\varepsilon$ for all $t \in (-\infty, -\frac{3\varepsilon}{2}]$ and $\varphi_\varepsilon(t) = 1 + \varepsilon$ for all $t \in [1 + \frac{3\varepsilon}{2}, \infty)$.

Proof Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Since $\int_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \eta_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(s) ds = 1$ and $-\varepsilon \leq \psi_\varepsilon(t) \leq 1 + \varepsilon$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we get

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(t) = \int_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \eta_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(s) \psi_\varepsilon(t-s) ds \in [-\varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon], \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Moreover, since $0 \leq \psi_\varepsilon(\tau_2) - \psi_\varepsilon(\tau_1) \leq \int_{\tau_2}^{\tau_1} |\psi'_\varepsilon(u)| du \leq \tau_2 - \tau_1$ for all $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$, we obtain that for each $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $t_1 \leq t_2$,

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(t_2) - \varphi_\varepsilon(t_1) = \int_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \eta_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(s) (\psi_\varepsilon(t_2-s) - \psi_\varepsilon(t_1-s)) ds \in [0, t_2 - t_1]$$

Observe that if $t \in [-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}]$ and $s \in [-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}]$, then $t-s \in [-\varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon]$, so that $\psi_\varepsilon(t-s) = t-s$. Thus, for each $t \in [-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}]$ we have

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(t) = \int_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \eta_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(s) \psi_\varepsilon(t-s) ds = t \int_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \eta_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(s) ds - \int_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} s \eta_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(s) ds = t.$$

Likewise, $\varphi_\varepsilon(t) = -\varepsilon \int_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \eta_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(s) ds = -\varepsilon$ for all $t \in (-\infty, -\frac{3\varepsilon}{2}]$ and $\varphi_\varepsilon(t) = (1 + \varepsilon) \int_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \eta_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(s) ds = 1 + \varepsilon$ for all $t \in [1 + \frac{3\varepsilon}{2}, \infty)$, as desired. □

Proposition 5.10 Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and φ_ε be a function defined as in Proposition 5.9. Then, the following hold:

(i) For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, $|\varphi_\varepsilon(t)| \leq 1 + \varepsilon$. Moreover, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi_\varepsilon(t) = t^+ \wedge 1$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

(ii) For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, $|\varphi'_\varepsilon(t)| \leq 1$. Moreover, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi'_\varepsilon(t) = 1_{[0,1]}(t)$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof (i) The first statement follows from Proposition 5.9. Let $t < 0$. Choose $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ so that $t < -\frac{3\varepsilon_0}{2}$. Then, if $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, then $\varphi_\varepsilon(t) = -\varepsilon$, so that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi_\varepsilon(t) = 0$. Next, let $t \in [0, 1]$. Then, $\varphi_\varepsilon(t) = t$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, so that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi_\varepsilon(t) = t$. Finally, let $t > 1$. Choose $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ so that $1 + \frac{3\varepsilon_1}{2} < t$. Then, if $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$, then $\varphi_\varepsilon(t) = 1 + \varepsilon$, so that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi_\varepsilon(t) = 1$. Thus, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi_\varepsilon(t) = t^+ \wedge 1$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

(ii) The first statement follows from Proposition 5.9. Let $t < 0$. Choose $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ so that $t < -\frac{3\varepsilon_0}{2}$. Then, if $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, then $\varphi'_\varepsilon(t) = 0$, so that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi'_\varepsilon(t) = 0$. Next, let $t \in [0, 1]$. Then, $\varphi'_\varepsilon(t) = 1$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, so that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi'_\varepsilon(t) = 1$. Finally, let $t > 1$. Choose $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ so that $1 + \frac{3\varepsilon_1}{2} < t$. Then, if $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$, then $\varphi'_\varepsilon(t) = 0$, so that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi'_\varepsilon(t) = 0$. In conclusion, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi'_\varepsilon(t) = 1_{[0,1]}(t)$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$. □

Proposition 5.11 *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then, there exists $\Phi_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\Phi_\varepsilon(t) = 0$ for all $t \in (-\infty, 1]$, $\Phi'_\varepsilon(t) = 1$ for all $t \in [1 + \varepsilon, \infty)$, and $\Phi'_\varepsilon(t) \in [0, 1]$ and $\Phi''_\varepsilon(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. In particular, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \Phi'_\varepsilon(t) = 1_{(1, \infty)}(t)$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be defined as in Proposition 5.9. Then, $\eta_\varepsilon(t) = 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta_\varepsilon(s) ds = 1$. Define ζ_ε given by

$$\zeta_\varepsilon(t) := \int_{-\infty}^t \eta_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \left(s - 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) ds, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then, $\zeta_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is an increasing function satisfying that $\zeta_\varepsilon(t) = 0$ for all $t \in (-\infty, 1]$ and $\zeta_\varepsilon(t) = 1$ for all $t \in [1 + \varepsilon, \infty)$. Now, define

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(t) := \int_{-\infty}^t \zeta_\varepsilon(s) ds, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then, Φ_ε is our desired one. Indeed, let $t \in (-\infty, 1]$. Then, $\Phi'_\varepsilon(t) = \zeta_\varepsilon(t) = 0$, so that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \Phi'_\varepsilon(t) = 0$. Finally, let $t \in (1, \infty)$. Then, choose $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ so that $1 + \varepsilon_0 < t$. Then, if $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, then $\Phi'_\varepsilon(t) = \zeta_\varepsilon(t) = 1$, so that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \Phi'_\varepsilon(t) = 1$. Therefore, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \Phi'_\varepsilon(t) = 1_{(1, \infty)}(t)$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$. \square

Lemma 5.12 *Let B be an open ball in \mathbb{R}^d with $d \geq 3$. Then, The following statements hold:*

(i) *If $\bar{\rho} \in H^{1,p}(B)$ with $p \in (d, \infty)$ and $\bar{h} \in H_0^{1,2}(B)$, then $\bar{\rho}\bar{h} \in H_0^{1,2}(B)$.*

(ii) *If $\bar{\rho} \in H^{1,p}(B)$ with $p \in (d, \infty)$ and $\bar{h} \in H^{1,q}(B)$ with $q \in [2, \infty)$, then $\bar{\rho}\bar{h} \in H^{1,p \wedge q}(B)$.*

Proof (i) Let $\bar{\rho} \in H^{1,p}(B)$ with $p \in (d, \infty)$ and $\bar{h} \in H_0^{1,2}(B)$. Then, by [15, Theorem 4.3] there exist sequences $(\bar{\rho}_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset C^\infty(\bar{B})$ and $(\bar{h}_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset C_0^\infty(B)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\rho}_n = \bar{\rho}$ in $H^{1,p}(B)$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{h}_n = \bar{h}$ in $H^{1,2}(B)$. Observe that $\bar{\rho}_n \bar{h}_n \in C_0^\infty(B)$ and

$$\nabla(\bar{\rho}_n \bar{h}_n) = \bar{h}_n \nabla \bar{\rho}_n + \bar{\rho}_n \nabla \bar{h}_n.$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{h}_n = \bar{h}$ in $L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}(B)$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nabla \bar{\rho}_n = \nabla \bar{\rho}$ in $L^d(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$, and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\rho}_n = \bar{\rho}$ in $L^\infty(B)$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nabla \bar{h}_n = \nabla \bar{h}$ in $L^2(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$, we obtain that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nabla(\bar{\rho}_n \bar{h}_n) = \bar{h} \nabla \bar{\rho} + \bar{\rho} \nabla \bar{h} = \nabla(\bar{\rho}\bar{h}), \quad \text{in } L^2(B, \mathbb{R}^d).$$

Similarly, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\rho}_n \bar{h}_n = \bar{\rho}\bar{h}$ in $L^2(B)$. Therefore, $\bar{\rho}\bar{h} \in H_0^{1,2}(B)$.

(ii) Let $\bar{\rho} \in H^{1,p}(B)$ with $p \in (d, \infty)$ and $\bar{h} \in H^{1,q}(B)$ with $q \in [2, \infty)$. Then, $\bar{\rho}\bar{h} \in H^{1,1}(B)$ and

$$\nabla(\bar{\rho}\bar{h}) = \bar{h} \nabla \bar{\rho} + \bar{\rho} \nabla \bar{h}.$$

Note that $\bar{\rho} \nabla \bar{h} \in L^q(B)$. Now consider the following cases:

Case 1): If $q \in [2, d)$, then $\bar{h} \in L^{\frac{qd}{d-q}}(B)$. Since $\nabla \bar{\rho} \in L^d(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$, we get $\bar{h} \nabla \bar{\rho} \in L^q(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$.

Case 2): If $q = d$, then $\bar{h} \in H^{1,d}(B) \subset L^{\frac{dq}{d-d}}(B)$. Since $\nabla \bar{\rho} \in L^p(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$, we have $\bar{h} \nabla \bar{\rho} \in L^d(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$.

Case 3): If $q \in (d, \infty)$, then $\bar{h} \in H^{1,q}(B) \subset L^\infty(B)$. Thus, $\bar{h} \nabla \bar{\rho} \in L^p(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$.

From Cases 1–3, we conclude that $\nabla(\bar{\rho}\bar{h}) \in L^{p \wedge q}(B, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Since $\bar{\rho}\bar{h} \in L^q(B) \subset L^{p \wedge q}(B)$, we deduce that $\bar{\rho}\bar{h} \in H^{1,p \wedge q}(B)$. \square

6 Conclusions and discussion

This paper addresses the local elliptic regularity results for stationary Fokker-Planck equations with general coefficients, demonstrating that when a solution with low regularity is given a priori, its density belongs to $H_{loc}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and, more precisely, to $H_{loc}^{1,p}(U) \cap C_{loc}^{0,1-d/p}(U)$ with $p \in (d, \infty)$ (see Theorem 1.1). The main results in this manuscript are derived using sectorial Dirichlet forms and their corresponding resolvents. This main results enable us to conduct a qualitative analysis of the invariant measures of solutions to stochastic differential equations (SDEs) and ensures that the invariant measures can be characterized as a solution to divergence-type partial differential equations (PDEs). Consequently, these findings hold significant potential for diverse applications in numerical analysis.

A detailed study and calculations are required to establish the counterpart of the results in this paper for the case $d = 2$. Throughout the paper, the *VMO* condition on A has been imposed, and it is necessary to investigate whether this condition can be removed or relaxed. Further research is required to lower the regularity assumptions on the drift vector fields and the zero-order terms. Specifically, further investigation is needed to explore the generalizability of the condition $c \in L_{loc}^p(U)$ in Corollary 1.3. Moreover, relaxing the regularity assumption on the drifts $\mathbf{H} \in L_{loc}^p(U, \mathbb{R}^d)$ in Corollary 1.3 presents an interesting direction for future research.

The existence of solutions to the stationary Fokker-Planck equation, i.e. the existence of infinitesimally invariant measures, is another critical topic. For instance, in [5, Theorem 1(i)] (cf. [6, Chapter 2] and [22, Section 2.2]), the existence of infinitesimally invariant measures was demonstrated using elliptic PDE theory, particularly the weak maximum principle and Harnack inequality. Developing analytical methods to ensure the existence of solutions under various conditions remains a necessary task. Alternatively, the existence of solutions to the stationary Fokker-Planck equation could be investigated stochastically by examining the invariant probability measure or stationary probability measure of the corresponding diffusion process (cf. [27]). Further studies are also needed to identify conditions under which the solution to the stationary Fokker-Planck equation represents a probability measure, especially in relation to the stationary probability measure of the diffusion process (cf. [5, Theorem 2] and [6, Corollary 2.4.2]).

Based on the local elliptic regularity results presented in this paper, exploring the possibility of establishing new results on the uniqueness of infinitesimally invariant measures is a promising direction for future research. A research dealing with uniqueness of infinitesimally invariant measures analytically is presented in [3] and [6, Chapter 4]. In particular, the result on non-uniqueness is referred to in [30]. Notably, in [23], it was demonstrated that the recurrence of the corresponding diffusion process or semigroup implies the uniqueness of the infinitesimally invariant measure. In that work, the local regularity results in [2] for solutions to stationary Fokker-Planck equations played a crucial role. Although the uniqueness problem could be addressed purely analytically, adopting a stochastic approach provides a compelling and rich framework for further investigation.

References

- [1] V.I. Bogachev, N.V. Krylov, M. Röckner, *Elliptic regularity and essential self-adjointness of Dirichlet operators on \mathbb{R}^n* , Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) 24 (1997), no. 3, 451–461.
- [2] V.I. Bogachev, N.V. Krylov, M. Röckner, *On regularity of transition probabilities and invariant measures of singular diffusions under minimal conditions*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 26(2001), no.11-12, 2037–2080.
- [3] V.I. Bogachev, V.I., Röckner, W. Stannat, *Uniqueness of solutions of elliptic equations and uniqueness of invariant measures of diffusions*, Sb.Math. 193(7), 945–976 (2002).
- [4] V.I. Bogachev, N.V. Krylov, M. Röckner, *Elliptic and parabolic equations for measures*, Russian Math. Surveys 64 (2009), no. 6, 973–1078.
- [5] V.I. Bogachev, M. Röckner, S. Shaposhnikov, *On positive and probability solutions of the stationary Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov equation*, Dokl. Math.85(2012), no.3, 350–354.

- [6] V.I. Bogachev, N.V. Krylov, M. Röckner, S. Shaposhnikov, *Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov equations*, Math. Surveys Monogr 207, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [7] V.I. Bogachev, S.V. Shaposhnikov *Integrability and continuity of solutions to double divergence form equations*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) 196 (2017), no. 5, 1609–1635.
- [8] V.I. Bogachev, *Stationary Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov equations*, Stochastic partial differential equations and related fields, 3–24. Springer Proc. Math. Stat., 229, Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [9] V.I. Bogachev, M. Röckner, S.V. Shaposhnikov, *Zvonkin’s transform and the regularity of solutions to double divergence form elliptic equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 48 (2023), no. 1, 119–149.
- [10] V.I. Bogachev, M. Röckner, S.V. Shaposhnikov, *Kolmogorov problems on equations for stationary and transition probabilities of diffusion processes* Theory Probab. Appl. 68 (2023), no. 3, 342–369.
- [11] S.C. Brenner, L.R. Scott, *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*, Texts Appl. Math., 15 Springer, New York, 2008
- [12] G. Cybenko, *Approximation by superpositions of a sigmoidal function*, Math. Control Signals Systems 2 (1989), no. 4, 303–314.
- [13] F. Chiarenza, M. Frasca, P. Longo, $W^{2,p}$ -solvability of the Dirichlet problem for nondivergence elliptic equations with *VMO* coefficients Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 336 (1993), no. 2, 841–853.
- [14] H. Dong, D.H. Kim, S. Kim, *The Dirichlet problem for second-order elliptic equations in non-divergence form with continuous coefficients*, arXiv:2402.17948.
- [15] L.C. Evans, R.F. Gariepy, *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*, revised edition. Textbooks in Mathematics (CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2015).
- [16] J. Frehse, *Essential selfadjointness of singular elliptic operators*, Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat. 8 (1977), no. 2, 87–107.
- [17] K. Hornik, M. Stinchcombe, H. White, *Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators*, Neural Networks, 2 (1989), 359–366.
- [18] C.-R. Hwang, S.-Y. Hwang-Ma, S.-J. Sheu, *Accelerating diffusions*, Ann. Appl. Probab. 15 (2005), 1433–1444.
- [19] J. Jost, *Partial Differential Equations*, Third edition, Grad. Texts in Math., 214, Springer, New York, 2013.
- [20] B. Kang, H. Kim, *On L^p -resolvent estimates for second-order elliptic equations in divergence form*, Potential Anal. 50 (2019), no.1, 107–133.
- [21] H. Kim, J. Oh, *Dirichlet problems for second order linear elliptic equations with L^1 -data*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. 22 (2023), no. 6, 1899–1917.
- [22] H. Lee, W. Stannat, G. Trunau, *Analytic theory of Itô-stochastic differential equations with non-smooth coefficients*, SpringerBriefs Probab. Math. Stat. Springer, Singapore, 2022.
- [23] H. Lee, G. Trunau, *Existence and uniqueness of (infinitesimally) invariant measures for second order partial differential operators on Euclidean space*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 507(2022), no.1, Paper No. 125778.
- [24] H. Lee, *Strong uniqueness of finite-dimensional Dirichlet operators with singular drifts*, Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top. 26 (2023), no. 3, Paper No. 2350009.

- [25] Z.M. Ma, M. Röckner, *Introduction to the theory of (nonsymmetric) Dirichlet forms*, Universitext Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
- [26] Y.A. Ma, T. Chen, E. Fox, *A complete recipe for stochastic gradient MCMC*, Advances in neural information processing systems 28 (2015).
- [27] R. Khasminskii, *Stochastic Stability of Differential Equations*, Stoch. Model. Appl. Probab., 66 Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.
- [28] P. Sjögren, *On the adjoint of an elliptic linear differential operator and its potential theory*, Ark. Mat. 11 (1973), 153–165.
- [29] W. Stannat, *(Nonsymmetric) Dirichlet operators on L^1 : existence, uniqueness and associated Markov processes*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) 28 (1999), no. 1, 99–140.
- [30] S.V. Shaposhnikov, *On nonuniqueness of solutions to elliptic equations for probability measures*, J. Funct. Anal. 254(10), 2690–2705 (2008)
- [31] Y. Song, Yang, S. Ermon. *Generative modeling by estimating gradients of the data distribution*, Advances in neural information processing systems 32 (2019).
- [32] Y. Song, J. Sohl-Dickstein, D.P. Kingma, A. Kumar, S. Ermon, B. Poole, *Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations*, in Proc. Int. Conf. Learn. Representations, (2021).
- [33] M. Taylor, *Pseudodifferential operators*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1981.
- [34] N.S. Trudinger, *Linear elliptic operators with measurable coefficients*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (3) 27 (1973), 265–308.
- [35] N.S. Trudinger, *Maximum principles for linear, non-uniformly elliptic operators with measurable coefficients*, Math. Z. 156 (1977), no. 3, 291–301.
- [36] J. Yoo, H. Lee, *Robust error estimates of PINN in one-dimensional boundary value problems for linear elliptic equations*, AIMS Math. 9 (2024), no. 10, 27000–27027.

Haesung Lee
 Department of Mathematics and Big Data Science,
 Kumoh National Institute of Technology,
 Gumi, Gyeongsangbuk-do 39177, Republic of Korea,
 E-mail: fthslt@kumoh.ac.kr, fthslt14@gmail.com